

NOVEMBER

COMMENTARY

A JEWISH REVIEW

The Spiritual Reconstruction
of European Jewry

SALO BARON

American Fuehrer in Dress Rehearsal

JAMES RORTY

Next Steps After the Charter

PERCY E. CORBETT

A Civilization Within a Civilization?

MORDECAI GROSSMAN

The Decline of the Theatre

LOUIS KRONENBERGER

A Prayer for Dew—A Story

PAUL GOODMAN

The Statue of Liberty Finds Its Poet

HERTHA PAULI

The British General Election

GEORGE ORWELL

From the American Scene—
Portrait of a Chaplain

MEYER LEVIN

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Randall Jarrell

Israel Knox

Theodor Gaster

Harold Rosenberg

Mary McCarthy

Kurt List

Alfred Werner

THE MONTH IN HISTORY CEDARS OF LEBANON THE STUDY OF MAN

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE



MAKING YOUR WISHES COME TRUE...

One wish has been fulfilled. Won by 3½ years of deadly struggle. With God's help, we have prevailed.

Now we have a chance to make another wish come true. For most of us, the outlook is a bright one. If we will simply use the brains, the will, the energy, the enterprise . . . the materials and resources . . . with which we won our war, we can't fail to win the peace and to make this the richest, happiest land the world has known.

Your wishes have been wrapped in that bright outlook. Your wish for a cottage by a lake. For your boy's col-

lege education. For a trip you long to take. For a "cushion" against emergencies and unforeseen needs.

You can make those wishes come true by buying bonds today . . . buying them regularly . . . and holding on to them in spite of all temptation.

There's no safer, surer investment in the world. You can count on getting back \$4 for every \$3 you put in E Bonds—as surely as you can count on being a day older tomorrow.

So why not be patriotic and smart at the same time?

**FULFILL YOUR WISH—BUY EXTRA BONDS
IN THE GREAT VICTORY LOAN!**

This space made available through the cooperation of Paper Novelty Manufacturing Co.—manufacturers of greeting cards—200 Fifth Avenue, New York City.



COMMENTARY

INCORPORATING CONTEMPORARY JEWISH RECORD

NOVEMBER 1945 VOLUME I, NUMBER 1

An Act of Affirmation	<i>Editorial Statement</i>	Elliot E. Cohen	1
The Spiritual Reconstruction of European Jewry		Salo Baron	4
American Fuehrer in Dress Rehearsal		James Rorty	13
Next Steps After the Charter		Percy E. Corbett	21
The Month in History		Sidney Hertzberg	30
A Civilization Within a Civilization?		Mordecai Grossman	39
The Decline of the Theater		Louis Kronenberger	47
A Prayer for Dew	<i>A Story</i>	Paul Goodman	52
The Statue of Liberty Finds Its Poet		Hertha Pauli	56
The British General Election		George Orwell	65
Cedars of Lebanon			
XVI. On Being a Jewish Person		Franz Rosenzweig	71
From the American Scene		Meyer Levin	79
Portrait of a Chaplain		Nathan Glazer	84
The Study of Man			
Books in Review			
Poems, by A. M. Klein		Randall Jarrell	88
Vohin Gehen Mir, by Jacob Lestchinsky		Israel Knox	90
The Bible and the Common Reader, by Mary Ellen Chase		Theodor Gaster	91
The Tables of the Law, by Thomas Mann		Harold Rosenberg	92
Felix Mendelssohn: Letters, edited by G. Selden-Goth		Kurt List	94
The Moral Conquest of Germany, by Emil Ludwig		Alfred Werner	95
Some of These Days, by Sophie Tucker		Mary McCarthy	96

Editor

ELLIOT E. COHEN

Managing Editor
CLEMENT GREENBERG

Editorial Assistants
NATHAN GLAZER, EVELYN SHEFNER

Business Manager
FRANCES GREEN

Contributing Editors

SALO BARON, SIDNEY HOOK, H. L. LURIE, JACOB R. MARCUS, SHALOM SPIEGEL

COMMENTARY, incorporating *Contemporary Jewish Record*: Published monthly by the American Jewish Committee: Commentary Publication Committee, Ralph E. Samuel, Chairman; David Sher, John Slawson, Alan M. Stroock, Ira M. Younker. 40c a copy; \$4.00 a year; 2 years, \$7.50; 3 years, \$10.00. Canadian and Foreign \$11.00 a year additional. Offices, 425 Fourth Avenue, New York 16. Entered as second-class matter August 11, 1939, at the post office in New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1945, by COMMENTARY. All rights, including translation into other languages, reserved by the publisher in the United States, Great Britain, Mexico, and all countries participating in the International Copyright Convention and the Pan-American Copyright Convention. Indexed in International Index to Periodicals, Index to Labor Articles, Magazine Subject Index, and Public Affairs Information Service.

Four weeks' advance notice, and old address as well as the new are necessary for change of subscriber's address.

In sponsoring COMMENTARY, the American Jewish Committee aims to meet the need for a journal of significant thought and opinion on Jewish affairs and contemporary world issues. Its pages will be hospitable to diverse points of view and belief, and it hopes to encourage original creative endeavor in the various fields of culture. The opinions and views expressed by COMMENTARY's contributors and editors are their own, and do not necessarily express the Committee's viewpoint or position. Its sponsorship of COMMENTARY is in line with its general program to enlighten and clarify public opinion on problems of Jewish concern, to fight bigotry and protect human rights, and to promote Jewish cultural interest and creative achievement in America.

IN FORTHCOMING ISSUES OF COMMENTARY

Are Jews Finished in Europe?

Zachariah Shuster

The current propaganda for a new "exodus" receives sober examination in the light of the facts and the logic of its implications. If Jews cannot hope to live in dignity and security in Europe, then the cause of democracy itself, not only that of the Jews, has suffered a terrible defeat in this war, says the writer.

Racism, End-Product of Imperialism

Hannah Arendt

Modern imperialism, by organizing men solely on the basis of race, threatens to destroy mankind. Dr. Arendt brilliantly shows the ideological and psychological factors that have contributed to the historical development of imperialism.

Gershwin, A Chapter In American Music

Kurt List

The secret of Gershwin's success was his ability to "glamorize" the emotions of the average man. Kurt List, composer and critic, analyzes his music and the social factors that conditioned it.

The Truth About Reconstructionism

Mordecai M. Kaplan

Re-stating the Reconstructionist position, Rabbi Kaplan answers the criticism levelled against the movement by Mordecai Grossman in "A Civilization Within a Civilization?" which appears in this issue.

Yankee City and Jewish Adaptation

Harold Orlansky

The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups, Warner and Srole's scientific study of the foreign-born and their immediate descendants in a typical New England town, provides the basis for an estimate of the present position of Jewish immigrants in American society.

ALSO: *Anti-Semitism, Personality Defense* by Bruno Bettelheim; *Portrait of a Labor Leader* by Ben B. Seligman; *We Fought Back in France* by Abraham Raisky; *Tschernichowsky, Mythological Poet* by Eisig Silberschlag; *Palestine, the Newest Frontier* by Bernard D. Weinryb.

BOOKS IN REVIEW: by David T. Bazelon, Paul Goodman, Hortense Powdermaker, Abba P. Lerner, Israel Knox, Milton Hindus, Maurice English, Gertrude Buckman, Ludwig Marcuse, Harold Rosenberg, Mordecai Chertoff, Saul Bellow.

General Lib. (P.R.R.)

Isaac Frank

2-25-46

V.1, no. 1-4

COMMENTARY

INCORPORATING CONTEMPORARY JEWISH RECORD

AN ACT OF AFFIRMATION

Editorial Statement

IT IS traditional to begin a new magazine with brave declarations. If we do not, we trust we shall be forgiven.

We begin at a moment heavy with a sense of human destiny. Every school-boy who listens to the radio knows that 1945 marks an epoch in world history. World War II has ended; the United Nations have won the greatest military victory of the ages; yet we stand troubled and hesitant before the glorious era of peace which we have awaited so long, and which now we seem not to know how to deal with.

In war, our country has demonstrated a giant's strength, in production, in cooperation, in planning, in courage. It remains to be seen—and present omens are ambiguous—whether this same giant's strength can be mustered as greatly and as wisely for the arts of peaceful living and the problems of peaceful world governance.

And since August 7, shadowing every moment of our thinking and feeling, there is the fearsome knowledge that through our inventiveness we have unleashed a power that has proved it can end a world war by a single blow, and that only waits to prove that it can—by other well-directed blows—build new, undreamed civilizations, or end the human race. Though ten thousand editorial writers the world over have said it again and again, it is still true: here man faces an ultimate challenge. Here, in its starkest form, we sometimes think, is what the scripture must have meant by the haunting phrase "the knowledge of good and evil."

As Jews, we are of an ancient tradition that, in a very special sense, keeps a vigil with history. We are peculiarly sensitive to the march of events, perhaps because, as some say ruefully, they have so often marched over us. So, at the least, we share with the rest of humanity the deep unease of breathing air almost visibly clotted with fantastic utopias or unimaginable cataclysms. And, in addition, we suffer our own special questionings, which in all candor, we believe humanity should share with us, possibly for the common good.

As Jews, we live with this fact: 4,750,000 of 6,000,000 Jews of Europe have been murdered. Not killed in battle, not massacred in hot blood, but slaughtered like cattle, subjected to every physical indignity—*processed*. Yes, cruel tyrants did this; they have

been hurled down; they will be punished, perhaps. Yes, there were men and women in other lands who raised their voices in protest, who lent helping hands. But we must also record this fact: the voices were not many, the hands were not many. There was a strange passivity the world over in the face of this colossal latter-day massacre of innocents, whether Jews or other "minorities."

And we must face this fact, too: that the kind of thinking and feeling that set loose this nightmare phenomenon still burns high in many countries, and lies latent in all. We have no gauge to measure the potentialities of this great Nazi secret weapon of World War II. But there are many—and they are not guided by personal hurt alone—who believe that here is a force that, in the political and social scene, can wreak destruction comparable to the atomic bomb itself. It was the *ignis fatuus* that lured the German people to their doom. It was the flame of the torch that kindled World War II. To resist it; to learn how to stamp it out; to re-affirm and restore the sense of the sanctity of the human person and the rights of man: — here, too, our world is greatly challenged. How that challenge is to be met is, of course, of particular interest to Jews, but hardly less to all mankind, if there is to be a human future.

AT THIS juncture, in the midst of this turbulence and these whirlwinds, we light our candle, COMMENTARY. Surely here is an act of faith.

It is an act of faith of a kind of which we seem peculiarly capable, we who, after all these centuries, remain, in spite of all temptation, the people of the Book.

We believe in the Word. We believe in study—as a guide to life, for the wisdom it brings to the counsels of men, and for its own sake. We have faith in the intellect, in the visions of visionary men, in the still, small voices of poets, and thinkers, and sages.

COMMENTARY is an act of faith in our possibilities in America. With Europe devastated, there falls upon us here in the United States a far greater share of the responsibility for carrying forward, in a creative way, our common Jewish cultural and spiritual heritage. And, indeed, we have faith that, out of the opportunities of our experience here, there will evolve new patterns of living, new modes of thought, which will harmonize heritage and country into a true sense of at-home-ness in the modern world. Surely, we who have survived catastrophe, can survive freedom, too.

In the search for light on the basic issues of peace and freedom and human destiny which challenge all mankind, COMMENTARY hopes to be of service. It goes without saying that the best magazine in the world will not solve our problems. But we have faith that a good magazine can help—by fairness, by searching out the truth, by encouraging fresh and free-ranging thinking, by bringing to bear upon our problems the resources of science, philosophy, religion, and the arts, by seeking out authentic voices and giving them open-house in which to be heard.

In this spirit, and with these aims, to publish the best magazine we know how to, hospitable to the broadest range of worth-while opinion — this is the sole mandate the editors have from COMMENTARY's sponsor, the American Jewish Committee. Few projects have a charter so free, so generous-minded, so full of faith in the value of honest thinking and decent writing. The *Contemporary Jewish Record*, which is to be incorporated into COMMENTARY, has had a charter in the same spirit, and under it gained

its reputation for fairness, high standards, and an unfailing sense of responsibility.

We think we have a kind of mandate from the people, too. A few weeks ago we addressed an inquiry to several thousand men and women, coast to coast, most of them active in Jewish affairs, some not so closely affiliated. We asked whether a good Jewish monthly was needed today, and, if so, what kind?

We were overwhelmed with replies, and not a little moved by the enthusiasm, interest, and warm good will for the project. Amidst the flood of counsel, advice, and admonition, there were five or six recurrent themes: "Give us authentic information, undistorted by propaganda and factionalism . . . give us the broadest discussion of the various Jewish creeds and philosophies . . . reflect our American life . . . make our Jewish heritage available . . . try not to be narrow, sectarian, parochial . . . encourage our best young minds. . . ."

IT IS a many-sided task. But COMMENTARY, as its name implies, aims to be many-sided. Commentary means a "record, a history, a memoir." We will reach back for the riches of the past. Commentary means a "running comment." We will keep abreast of the march of events. Commentary means "interpretation." We will present significant discussion by many minds on the basic issues of our times.

But there is also a traditional Jewish meaning of commentary — somewhat private, but very real, we think — which we as editors cherish. Our ancient scribes and sages, as we know, only wrote commentaries on the revelation which was the Law. But we know that these ever-changing interpretations of the past by the men of wisdom and men of insight of each generation, became for that generation more than merely commentaries. It became the truth that men lived by. Truth, as someone has said, is an ever-flowing, ever-renewing stream. . . .

We said we would not speak brave words, but we almost have. As editors, we know our place. It is really a humble function. We are like well-diggers. We roll up our sleeves and in the sweat of our brows, we dig. And if the time and place are right, and the omens are propitious—of a sudden, fresh, cool, flowing waters. . . .

To this task, soberly and earnestly, we dedicate ourselves.

ELLIOT E. COHEN

THE SPIRITUAL RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN JEWRY

SALO BARON

ALTHOUGH the blackout is slowly lifting from the areas where once flourished the largest centers of Jewish life in Europe, only fragmentary reports concerning the survivors have filtered through to the outside world. The simplest information, such as how many Jews remain alive—and where—is sparse and often contradictory; and we know practically nothing about the forms of their community life, their religious observances, or the character of their hopes for survival as Jews. Under these circumstances, any discussion of the spiritual reconstruction of the Jewries of Europe must inevitably be little more than one man's personal estimate of long-term trends.

The very phrase "spiritual reconstruction" can be subtly misleading, in that it evokes a picture of rebuilding in terms of bricks and mortar. The life of the spirit is by its very nature immaterial, intangible. To a greater degree than for many centuries past the spiritual life of European Jewry will be determined by the evolution of factors affecting

RECOGNIZED as one of the leading Jewish historians in this country, Professor SALO BARON has been teaching, lecturing and writing here since 1926. He is perhaps best known for his monumental three-volume studies, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* and *The Jewish Community*, which have become the standard works in their fields. Since 1930 he has been professor of Jewish history, literature and institutions at Columbia University. His activities spread into many branches of Jewish and academic life; he has been president of the Conference on Jewish Relations, of the Academic Committee for the Hebrew University, and has served on the executive committee of the American Historical Society. Since 1939 Professor Baron has been editor of *Jewish Social Studies*. His writings have appeared there and elsewhere, and he has published numerous shorter books, among them an essay on Maimonides. He was born in Tarnow, Austria, in 1895.

what the Protestants like to call the "invisible church." The *heshbon ha-nefesh*, the searching of the souls of countless individuals who daily faced death and mutilation under the Nazi terror, who as a group suffered physical and spiritual agonies unrivaled in history, may well prove of more enduring value in the reconstruction of the Jewish spirit than the outward communal or ritualistic forms of their religious life. Unfortunately the forms which this searching of soul may have assumed or the probable circles of its influence must remain for the present within the realm of speculation.

Surviving Amid the Debris

WHAT news has already reached the world from the concentration camps holds forth little promise of an immediate spiritual revival. The greater number of the surviving inmates—especially in the Jewish camps—were found to have been reduced to the level of gross animal existence; many had become too weakened to be capable of anything beyond a passive vegetation. Both life and death had been drained of their meaning, with the borderline between so tenuous and so easily crossed. Some Jews, employed in the crematoria, seemed to have developed an unbelievable callousness to the sight of the mutilated bodies of their comrades, and others had even been forcibly employed in the extermination of men and women of their own faith.

However, religious history has given evidence of how deeply humanity may sink, and still rise again to high spiritual levels. The close interrelationship between sin and faith, degradation and exaltation of the spirit, has been long known to Jewish sages and has been demonstrated in the experience of mystics and believers of all faiths. And—to consider positive factors—there were countless Jews in Europe whose saintly and self-

sacrificing behavior has the redemptive quality of great martyrdom. In addition to the 30,000 heroic defenders of the Warsaw ghetto and the dauntless thousands of Jewish partisans and Maquis, there were many other unsung heroes, among them rabbis, teachers and social workers, who like the late Emanuel Ringelblum worked unselfishly for the Jewish community until the very end. The self-immolation, by mutual compact, of the girls in the *Bnoth-Jacob* institution to escape defilement by Nazi soldiers has the quality of a medieval *shehitah*. Some of these unnumbered heroes have undoubtedly survived, to bring the example and the inspiration of their courage and idealism into the new life.

We can only guess at the ultimate religious development of the thousands of Jewish children who spent their formative years in Christian homes. Unlike the traditional experience of *tinnokot she-nishbu ben ha-goyim* (children held captive among Gentiles), these children have had the novel experience of *tinnokot she-nitslu al yede ha-goyim* (children saved by Gentiles). Many may never revert to Judaism, and will be permanently lost to the Jewish community. Others will carry into their later life as Jews fond memories of Christian rituals and Christian legends, associating them with warm human contacts. Possibly we may witness within a few years the emergence of some new Judeo-Christian syntheses which will ferment a new religious orientation and contribute new elements to Jewish religious history, like that once infused by the Marranos. Or perhaps their eclectic example may reinforce the trend toward ceremonial orthodoxy characteristic of our disillusioned generation.

All this is extremely hypothetical. But it is not unreasonable to hope that out of the depths of misery and despair some new saving forms of belief and observance may arise which will provide an answer to the perplexities of our Jewish experience. The glimpses we have had of life in the large ghetto of Terezin (Theresienstadt) may encourage the hope that a few creative individuals, like Leo Baeck and some of his associates, having been spared the worst of the suffering, may

retain the vitality and freedom of meditation necessary to form such a new integration. The great religious message for which the prosperous but as yet spiritually uncreative Jewish communities of Western Europe and America have been groping ever since the Emancipation may yet be spoken by these shattered remnants of European Jewry.

But developments of this sort cannot be expected overnight. It may be years before the Jewish masses in Europe have recovered sufficiently from shock to begin to look inward and find meaning in their experiences. Even then, a spiritual resurgence, involving the inner life of unknown, often humble individuals, is not likely to be reported on the front pages: the "invisible church" is not news. Fuller knowledge of the new spiritual trends in European Jewry may be expected only when they have assumed definite character as a movement.

Restoring the Book

IN THE end, the destiny of European Jewry will, of course, be settled in Europe; and the course which postwar reconstruction will take will primarily depend on the political and social patterns emerging in the various countries.

But before we turn to the discussion of these basic factors let us outline how Jewish communities outside Europe can assist their decimated co-religionists on the Continent in reconstructing Jewish institutional life—so important for all organized religion—and to reacquire the most fundamental tools of worship and education.

All over Europe, synagogues and Jewish schools have been destroyed, pillaged and desecrated by the Nazis. European Jews have been deprived of even such rudimentary instruments of the spiritual life as prayer-books, Hebrew Bibles and traditional literature. Teachers attempting to re-educate the Jewish youth find themselves crippled by the lack of texts and simple educational facilities.

These losses must be repaired from the outside. They cannot be supplied by the impoverished Jews of Europe, who will re-

quire large-scale assistance to meet elementary needs, from government agencies and from the Joint Distribution Committee and other Jewish organizations, if they are to survive the rigors of the coming winter.

The reconstruction of synagogues and schools will offer many difficulties, varying regionally and even locally. In hundreds of Jewish communities the synagogue structure, even if preserved, may never again serve its original purpose, simply for the lack of worshippers. In the case of certain buildings venerable because of their antiquity, beauty or historical association, their preservation as museums should be considered. They may, in the course of years, become centers attracting travellers and pious pilgrims, and serve as historic reminders of former glories and sources of inspiration for many generations.

Books have always been the very life-blood of the "people of the Book." In compiling a bibliography of Jewish social studies for the years 1938-39, the last two more or less "normal" pre-war years, the present writer was amazed by the undaunted vitality of even much harassed Polish Jewry, as reflected in the vast output of books and articles. Written in Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish and other languages, this literature testified to the profound and variegated intellectual and spiritual interests of this largest sector of European Jewry on the eve of its unprecedented tragedy. Now Jewish books of any kind have become extremely scarce all over the Continent. One hears pathetic descriptions of devoted teachers in France and elsewhere trying to reassemble classes of pupils of varying age and capacity, who are reduced to the use of a single copy of some textbook, talmudic tractate or volume of poems that by a freak of chance happened to escape the wrath of the Nazis.

On the other hand, various German caches detected by the occupying forces contain a large number of priceless manuscripts, incunabula and rare editions which, even if returned to their original communities, would often appear to them as luxuries incongruous to their impoverished state. Nor are they

likely to be able, for years to come, adequately to take care of such irreplaceable treasures. At the same time the enormous collections of Judaica assembled by the Nazis in Frankfurt and Munich, only small parts of which could possibly be traced back to rightful owners, will in improper hands even be a source of danger. Unless transferred or dispersed, these collections, brought together for the sole purpose of pseudo-scientific anti-Semitic propaganda, can become sources of re-infection.

The Jews of the Allied countries, especially the intact communities outside Europe, can prove extremely helpful here. They can help Allied officials stationed in Europe locate the Nazi loot, restore it to its rightful owners or else to make the wisest disposition possible for the benefit of the general cultural reconstruction of European Jewry. Problems of reparation for losses sustained which are no longer retrievable, problems of a better and more rational redistribution of these cultural resources in the light of the new realities, the possible replenishment of lacunae from the accumulated resources of the more prosperous Jewish communities and the assignment of certain cultural resources to Palestine, the Western Hemisphere and other Jewish communities, in return for services rendered directly—these are all problems of staggering complexity and difficulty, which have thus far received scant attention from the authoritative bodies devoted to Jewish political action.

However, a beginning has been made. Under the auspices of the Conference on Jewish Relations, acting in collaboration with the Joint Distribution Committee, the American Association for Jewish Education and various other agencies interested in this work, a Commission of scholars, assisted by special research fellows, has begun to accumulate the necessary information and to think through the various legal problems involved. It has also begun to collaborate with the numerous non-Jewish agencies, both governmental and private, working in related fields. A similar organization has been established in Palestine under the aus-

pices of the Hebrew University. In England the Jewish Historical Society has taken the initiative along similar lines. Efforts are now being made to correlate the activities of the three countries, in order, finally, to evolve a concerted plan of action.

A tentative list of all Jewish cultural treasures in the countries overrun by the Nazis will soon be available to all interested agencies. Fully documented, it will enable the organs of the United Nations, including Jewish army chaplains, the personnel of the Joint Distribution Committee, Jewish press correspondents, among others, to identify and help reassemble these cultural collections.

Here is an example of how we—individually and collectively—can aid the spiritual reconstruction of European Jewry. Communal leaders and scholars, rabbis and publicists, social workers and educators may greatly contribute to the intensive thinking, the gathering of information and the securing of cooperation with national and international bodies, all of which are indispensable for the performance of these tasks. Contact and discussion with their colleagues formerly connected with the communal and cultural institutions in Axis-occupied countries and now living in the United States may help secure some valuable data and insights, the aggregate of which will pave the way for ultimate constructive action. Such action certainly must not be delayed much longer.

The New Communities

ULTIMATELY, however, the course of Jewish spiritual reconstruction in Europe will depend on the character and strength permitted to the emerging organized communities by the postwar political structures of the various countries. For, apart from the enormous financial difficulty of restoring communities whose accumulated resources have been destroyed or dispersed, whose leadership has been exterminated, whose members will in part return from distant areas and in part consist of a variety of new arrivals, their very political and legal foundations are now a matter of gravest concern. Let us state the case at its optimistic best. Let us suppose

that the residue of hatred left by the Nazis is not widespread or great, and that the Jews in all European countries will enjoy perfect equality of rights, not only theoretically, as a matter of paper constitutions or international guarantees, but also as a matter of practice. Let us further assume that there will be no economic or social discrimination against individual Jews because of their religion, language or nationality. (These assumptions will, of course, be disputed by most realistic observers.) Even so, the future of the organized Jewish community and its institutions is subject to great, indeed vital uncertainties.

The recent inclusion of a section on "human rights" in the charter of the new international organization and the provision for an international commission to promote their application is undoubtedly a great moral achievement. Undoubtedly, too, it will have considerable bearing on communal life. It is wise to remember, however, that the provisions for protecting "human rights" apply not to individuals but to groups. Certainly, they are not meant to safeguard against purely individual miscarriage of justice. When an employer does not like an employee and discharges him without cause, when a political "boss" prevents a citizen from getting a license, when a school superintendent refuses to appoint a qualified school teacher—such grievances can never be appealed to the International Commission. It has jurisdiction only when it can be proven that instances of political or economic discrimination are based upon the individual's race, religion, language or nationality. In other words, it is the group that is now protected, by virtue of the fact that membership in it can no longer be penalized by public bodies with impunity. Such protection of "human rights," if effective, will go a long way toward safeguarding the Jewish community as such.

This negative protection, however, is not likely to prove sufficient. The Jewish communities of Europe, throughout the centuries of their long history, have had a recognized status as a part of the state system. The disestablished Jewish communities in France

after the separation of State and Church in 1906, the pre-fascist Italian communities and a few other "voluntaristic" bodies were only exceptional episodes in a thousand-year history which saw the communities serving as an organ of public law and supported in the exercise of their authority by all governments, regardless of their particular forms or biases. As recently as the period between the two world wars, the Jewish communities of Germany, Poland, the successor states of Austria-Hungary and fascist Italy had the right of taxing their members, even against their will. Even in the Soviet Union the secularized Jewish community has enjoyed legal authority, as a result of the minority rights granted by the Soviet regime to all national minorities.

The American system of purely voluntary allegiance to a congregation or other community institution has been quite alien to the experience of the vast majority of European Jews. The achievement of American Jewry in building a voluntaristic community without the support of public authority has been magnificent. At the same time, it must be remembered that we have been aided in this achievement by the constant influx of immigrants from communities of public law, whose habits and experience encouraged the continuation of some organized form of communal life on this side of the Atlantic.

Now the communities of the United States will be deprived of the stimulus provided by this mass immigration. American Jewry more and more must now stand wholly on its own feet. Indeed, it must lend its spiritual resources to its European brethren, especially since all support of the religious communities through public law will apparently be withdrawn in most European countries.

To be sure, the present trend among the so-called provisional governments, at least within the area occupied by the Western Allies, points toward the restoration of the political and legal status prevailing before the war or Hitler's rise to power. But there seems little doubt that, before very long, strong revolutionary forces, in evidence

throughout the European Continent, will cause a considerable reshaping of the economic and political structures of all these countries. One must seriously doubt whether the resistance forces, upon assuming and holding power, will tolerate the re-establishment of the various churches along traditional lines. It is far more likely that they will strive for complete separation of State and Church, despite the incontestably weighty opposition of the established churches. Separation, as in America and in France, would remove the very props from under the continued legal recognition of the Jewish community as an organ of public law.

It is very difficult for an American reader to realize what separation implies for all Continental denominations. In the light of the age-old interlocking of "throne and altar" in Catholic countries and the even deeper "erastianism" of the Lutheran populations, separation entails an almost total transvaluation of all facets of organized religion: one need but recall how totally lost Protestant leadership was for several years in the areas ceded by the Germans to Poland in 1919, when it was suddenly deprived of all state support. Even the socialistically controlled early Weimar Republic was forced to come to the aid of the churches after issuing a formal decree of separation and to buttress them by many legislative enactments. The disaffection of the Catholic groups with the French law of separation, on the other hand, has for the last forty years been one of the chief bones of contention in the Third Republic's stormy career. It has given new impetus to the disruptive forces of "integral" nationalism and royalism and, by allying itself with all other forces of reaction, finally helped bring upon France the disaster of 1940.

That is why, even if the Central and East European Jewish communities had otherwise remained intact, a decree of separation in itself would have necessitated far-reaching readjustments. Totally ruined as they are now, it would be tantamount to forcing a fresh start in their historical evolution.

There is, of course, an alternative to this dilemma—the recognition of the Jewish people as a national minority enjoying national minority rights. If this were established, the revived Jewish community, though in many respects different from its predecessors, would still be recognized as an entity of public law with considerable control over its membership; if need be, by legal enforcement.

Certainly in the Soviet Union the Jews will continue to enjoy the minority safeguards which the Lenin government had enacted in the early stages of the Revolution. But it would be rash to assume that the system prevailing in the Soviet Union would automatically apply to its various satellite countries, especially Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania, which have demonstrated increasing tendencies toward cultural homogeneity, rather than ethnic and cultural pluralism. Despite the terrific bloodshed, it still appears likely that these four countries will harbor, between them, the majority of European Jewry living outside the Soviet area.

Jewish Minority Rights

POLAND, deprived of her provinces east of the Curzon line, will retain only insignificant minorities, whether of Jews, Ukrainians or White Russians. The only minority which will have increased numerically, owing to both the colonization under Hitler and the prospective annexation of German-speaking areas by the Poles, will be the Germans. Obviously, for both domestic and international reasons, the new Polish regime will try to reduce the German minority, already depleted by the masses of refugees who escaped before the onrushing Soviet armies in 1945, to an absolute minimum. In the brief period of its administration it has already succeeded in expelling untold numbers of Germans across the border and in replacing them by Poles from both inside and outside the country. While in Potsdam President Truman was informed that only some 1,500,000 Germans have remained in the territories handed over to the Polish government.

Czechoslovakia, also, has publicly pro-

claimed its intention to rid itself of the bulk of the Sudeten-Germans by forcible, as well as voluntary, expatriation and to assimilate the rest. It has already lost practically its entire Ukrainian minority through the cession of Carpatho-Ruthenia to the Soviet Union. The Czech leaders have been less outspoken in regard to the Hungarian minority, but it stands to reason that the same procedure would be applied also to that minority which, long articulately dissatisfied with the territorial settlements of the Peace of Trianon, has actively contributed to Czechoslovakia's downfall in the critical years of 1938-39. Should this program be realized, both Poland and Czechoslovakia would become national states with but slight admixture of minority groups other than Jewish.

Hungary, reduced to its pre-war frontiers, will naturally remain, as it was before 1939, a national state with no minority other than the Jews. More complex is the position of the Hungarian and German minorities in Rumania, long satellite of the Axis Powers. But with the likely elimination of the Ukrainian and Bulgarian minorities, as a result of the prospective territorial readjustments, Rumania, too, would strive to become a national state, again finding a major exception in the Jews.

History has demonstrated that in countries where the national composition is fairly homogeneous the Jews evince little interest in being singled out as the only minority. And their staunchest friends, usually liberal-minded people who desire to eliminate nationalist friction, see even less merit in having them thus segregated from the majority. Since liberty of conscience will eventually be granted constitutionally by all Eastern European countries, the Jewish community, in the long run, is likely to claim there religious rather than national rights.

The meaning of this powerful trend is clearly indicated by the repeated and unequivocal statements of the new Rumanian government, exhorting its Jewish citizens to submit to complete assimilation in return for full equality of rights. Even more outspoken has been President Benes of Czechoslovakia.

In his interview with the correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on August 10, he greatly minimized the spread of anti-Semitism in his country outside the province of Slovakia, but he is reported to have added this highly significant prediction:

The establishment of a Jewish Home in Palestine is a necessity for all nations, because anti-Semitism is a regrettable but practically inevitable social phenomenon. It will not vanish till the creation of a Jewish country granting citizenship to all Jewry. It would be difficult to repatriate all Jews there, but it could be done soon at least for the European Jews. Those who would not leave for Palestine ought to be assimilated completely to the people of the country they want to live in, or live there as citizens of a foreign state.

In 1915 or 1925, even in 1935, a declaration of this type would generally have been regarded as coming from a radical anti-Semite. But it was uttered in 1945 by a man with a long record of friendship for the Jews who with Masaryk fought first for national rights within the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and later helped establish genuine minority rights in his reborn country. It will not do to explain Benes' change of mind in psychological terms and to assert that, as a reaction to Sudeten-German and Magyar treachery, his pendulum has swung to the other extreme. The Jewish world might note his statement as a frank, perhaps brutally frank, expression of the new relationships now being established between the Central European nationalities. Considered together with the probable law of separation and the resulting absence of a religious community which can act as an organ of public law, these new trends seem indeed to place the bulk of Central European Jewry before the alternatives of emigration, life under a neo-medieval status of permanent aliens, or complete assimilation. Unless, of course, their own indomitable will to survive should find a new, as yet unpredictable form of Jewish spiritual and communal existence which would preserve both its distinct identity and historic continuity.

The only larger country in the Russian orbit where national heterogeneity with

accompanying safeguards for national cultures is likely to prevail after the war is Yugoslavia. This country may be augmented both in size and heterogeneity by a federation with Bulgaria and the inclusion of some Macedonian and some formerly Italian or Austrian areas. In this amalgam of races, religions and languages, the Jews would stand a chance of securing national minority rights, effectively and not merely theoretically. Largely composed of relatively young, small and struggling communities whose roots in history and national consciousness are, for the most part, far less strong than those of their co-religionists to the North, this group is not likely to make far-reaching use of such rights.

Moreover, here, as in the Soviet Union, national minority rights have tended to receive a geographic emphasis. Exercise of national autonomy has increasingly become concentrated around a particular nationality's close geographic settlements, in which it holds the undisputed majority. Enjoyment of similar rights by members of that nationality living outside its area appeared as a mere extension of the rights secured within the area. As such, it necessarily assumed a somewhat exceptional character. However, what was the exception for other groups was the norm in the case of the Jews. Even in the western provinces of the Soviet Union the Jews never constituted a majority in a whole district, although they outnumbered their neighbors in individual cities or hamlets. Hence the vigorous efforts made by Communist Jewish leadership, supported by both the government and American Jewish organizations, to secure for the Jewish minority, too, territorial moorings in "autonomous regions" around the Black and the Azov Seas. Biro-Bidjan, in particular, was intended to grow into a Jewish republic. So long as such majority status within a confined area was not secured, however, Russian Jewry, though a significant minority in both numbers and cultural attainments, had an unavoidably exceptional status even within the few-score national minorities recognized as such by the Union.

Some may deny, of course, that national minority rights have any bearing upon the spiritual reconstruction of European Jewry. Indeed, such rights in their conception, and still more in their execution, have tended to secularize Jewish life, to emphasize its political, economic or, at best, linguistic-cultural facets, which are not usually thought of as elements of "spiritual" life. Not that there are lacking men in the world, Jews among them, who even now talk of the spirituality of nationalism. Nationalism, as the indubitable mainspring of wars and revolutions, has fallen into disrepute in recent years. But it has not therefore lost any of its realistic vitality—many people, who vehemently condemn nationalism, are themselves nationalists when it comes to their own country or group. The present writer has devoted much time and study to the effort to clarify interrelations between nationalism and organized religion. He has found that not only is the contrast between these two forms of group life and personal allegiance highly exaggerated, but that the religious mainsprings of some types of modern nationalism, as well as the national foundations of some religious denominations, have never been sufficiently understood. The complexity of life becomes even more clearly visible when one tries to segregate some of its facets for purposes of scholarly scrutiny. Without going here into further detail he can state that, in his considered judgment, the problem of Jewish minority rights in Europe may indeed have a major bearing upon the future of all Jewish spiritual life, including its strictly religious manifestations.

Jewish Fate in the New World

ONE may perhaps anticipate after this war certain clashes—thoroughly bloodless, we may sincerely believe, and outwardly amicable, but none the less vehement—in both ideology and its corresponding institutional forms, between the systems prevailing in the Soviet Union and in the United States. The European Jewish scene is likely to reflect in miniature this vast world conflict in its own rivalry between the disestablished religious

community along American lines and the established secularized *Volksgemeinde*, largely following the patterns dynamically evolving from Russia's policy of national liberation. As has frequently been true before, Jewish community life and even certain external forms of Jewish spirituality will reflect these titanic struggles in the world at large. Of course, the two areas need not correspond exactly. The new Poland, for example, although following Russia's lead in her international policies and applying some broad socialist program in her domestic social adjustments may nevertheless yield to the deeply rooted Catholic traditions of the peasant masses and fully revive the Catholic Church. In this case, the Jews, too, are likely to possess an established religious community of the traditional kind, differing from both the American and the Russian forms.

Czechoslovakia and Rumania, on the other hand, though paying lip service to Western democratic principles and socialistically revamping their social and political structures, will apparently try to deny formal recognition to both the Jewish religious community and national minority. They may try to obliterate completely the separate communal identity of their residual Jewries. In most other countries, it appears, the Jews will see placed before them the alternatives of living as a strictly religious group, without recognition by public law, or as a national minority possibly enjoying some safeguards in domestic as well as international law.

No one will venture to predict the immediate outcome of the vast internal struggles now shaping up throughout the European world. One may confidently assert, however, that the momentary trend toward monolithic national states is likely to prove even less successful in our increasingly interdependent world than were the somewhat similar attempts in early modern times to establish exclusively religious states. After bringing untold miseries to all European lands the principle of *cuius regio eius religio* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

had to be abandoned universally in favor of the opposing doctrine of the liberty of conscience. The prevailing trend today undoubtedly is toward the recognition of a parallel principle of *cuius regio eius natio*, i.e. that state boundaries should fully coincide with the ethnic and cultural frontiers and, in case of conflict, the latter be made to conform with the former. This trend toward what is in essence a religion of nationality has already plunged the world into an endless series of internecine wars culminating in the two world wars. It must sooner or later be reversed in our technologically, economically and culturally ever more unified world. Even the gigantic struggle between the American and the Russian ways of life and of their intermediate modified forms in various lands, must before very long resolve itself into some superior synthesis, if mankind is to escape the utter self-destruction of a third world war.

Like everybody else, the Jews will be deeply affected by these international developments. The future destinies of all organized religion and religious freedom will profoundly influence Jewish life as well. Should the principle of universal cultural-ethnic freedom come to supplement the fairly well accepted liberty of religious conscience, the future course of Jewish history, too, will be significantly altered. Of equal significance will be the ultimate solution of such specifically Jewish problems of inter-

national concern as the future status of Palestine and the outlawry of anti-Semitism.

No less important, for Jewish history, will be the long-term effects of what world Jewry and, most immediately, its European segment, will do to achieve its own spiritual and communal regeneration. In the last resort, only the Jewish people's firm and persistent will to survive, clad in ever new appropriate institutional forms—though far less spectacular and dramatic than political events on the world scene—will be the truly decisive factor. Such a will, nurtured often from unconscious, even irrational springs of spiritual yearning and historical heritage, will ultimately find a way of communal readjustment to a new world order. The duration of this process, however, and the extent of the sufferings it will entail will, in large measure, depend upon the determination of Jewish leadership now and here to do all it can in hastening the cultural regeneration of European Jewry. In doing so it must endeavor to stimulate the "creative élan" of the masses and of their as yet unknown intellectual vanguard, to furnish them the necessary cultural tools and to help remove from their path certain political and economic obstacles. But it must absolutely refrain from laying down for them any definitive course of thought and action; least of all by forcing them to conform to old, accustomed and partly petrified modes of Jewish historic experience.

AMERICAN FUEHRER IN DRESS REHEARSAL

JAMES RORTY

HITLER has been off the scene less than a year, yet already it is difficult to believe that this flagrant little paranoid could have dominated the drama of Western civilization during its most critical modern period.

For nearly a decade after World War I Hitler seemed to his contemporaries as ridiculous as a candidate for power as Joe McWilliams seemed in 1940 to the disgusted citizens who spat and walked away from his cheap "covered wagon" in Yorkville. Yet Hitler lived to impose his private nightmare upon the world; and Joe McWilliams is only one of scores of more or less pathological, more or less venal agitators who will try to exploit the market for anti-Semitism created by the economic and social tensions of our postwar adjustment.

In appraising our native anti-Semitic demagogues one must not be misled by the fact that their ideological patter consists of easily refuted economic and sociological nonsense. Frequently they talk and act like lunatics, but that does not make them either lunatics or harmless; on the contrary, they

ONE of the last of the crusading journalists, JAMES RORTY has been fighting all his career to extend civil rights and to expose the dangers threatening them. The present article is based on the scientific analysis of anti-Semitic demagogues, here and on the West Coast, made by the Institute of Social Research, Columbia University, under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee. Mr. Rorty, who has been working and writing specifically in the field of race relations for some years, is the author of *His Master's Voice: The Story of American Advertising; American Medicine Mobilizes*; a number of pamphlets and plays, and two books of poetry. At present he, together with a medical collaborator, is completing a book on the nutritional, economic and political dimensions of the problem of food, which will be published next spring. He is married to the sociologist, Winifred Raushenbush.

must be regarded as potentially serious political forces who, given favoring soil and season, might easily grow and flourish disastrously.

Not in America? Let us remember Huey Long. If Huey Long had not died, the course of American and world history might have been very substantially changed. In the spring and summer of 1935, while Huey was studying his maps and jockeying the pawns of his political alliances, not only Louisiana but all America was still wallowing in a bread-and-circuses relief economy. Huey was the ablest demagogue the depression had produced. With his Share-the-Wealth movement entrenched in Louisiana, he was ready to move into the arena of national politics.

The Kingfish was shot. From the relief economy we moved step by step into the war economy. The showmen of our proto-fascism went back to selling snake-oil and salvation.

Today, back on the scene again is the brass-lunged fundamentalist showman, Gerald L. K. Smith, who deserted William Dudley Pelley's Silver Shirts to beat a drum in Huey's circus, and promptly at his death attempted through copyright to steal the name "Share-the-Wealth." Major frustrations of American life remain unresolved, and evidently our leading anti-Semitic demagogues see their chance in the economic and social dislocations of reconversion.

Even at this early date, we see an attempted mobilization. With Smith and Joe McWilliams among his aides, Bob Reynolds, ex-Senator, ex-patent-medicine salesman, and ex-circus barker, is currently driving to organize a large-scale coalitionist American Nationalist Party, a kind of proto-fascist political holding company composed of reactionary Republicans, certain Southern Democrats, and a varied assortment of po-

litical cultists, ex-Communists, crackpots, and fully pedigreed gangsters.

A Pioneer Study

SINCE experience teaches us to regard such developments seriously, the systematic study of these would-be American Fuehrers is very much in order. To that end the resources of social science have been mobilized in the recent studies by the Institute of Social Research at Columbia University, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee. Although these studies are still preliminary, the data already in hand are of extraordinary interest and value.

In what follows, the writer draws largely upon the transcripts and analyses of the broadcasts of George Allison Phelps and the Reverend X, of the West Coast, and of the street-corner speeches of Joseph E. McWilliams. These three specimens exhibit, sufficiently for our present purposes, the three schools of anti-Semitic demagoguery from which the majority of the contemporary American practitioners would appear to derive, namely, a corruption of religious fundamentalism, both Protestant and Catholic, salesmanship, especially advertising, and lunatic-fringe politics.

In the Institute's studies we see the Fuehrer in action, interrupted only by the sociological and psycho-analytic comments of leading authorities in the social sciences, to whom the performance of the agitator is neither novel nor bewildering.

For *performance* it is! The studies reveal clearly that the key to the understanding of the Fuehrer type is to recognize that his madness has indeed a method, and the method is that of a showman.

The power of the demagogue is not the power of ideas or arguments or economic programs, lending themselves to analysis and refutation by rational counter-argument. It is the enchantment of the emotionally susceptible by the power of a drama created by a talented author-producer-actor, in which the audience are made participants. Under the spell of the performance fantasy supplants reality, the mind is short-

circuited, and men are habituated to hatred and thoughts of violence.

A few notes on the biographies and background of the American demagogues before we turn to the description and analysis of their Fuehrer-drama, with its stage-villain Jew and its stage hero-savior offering salvation through sadism.

The three commodities for which there is apparently always a market in our society are holiness, health, and economic Shangri-La's attained by some kind of funny-money alchemy (Free Silver, the technocratic erg, the Townsend Plan, Thirty-Dollars-Every-Thursday, Share-the-Wealth, Joe McWilliams' Serviceman's Reconstruction Plan, etc., etc.). Since the sales formula is essentially the same, the salesmen of these various commodities readily transfer their talents from one field to another. James True was once a third-string space-writer for *Printer's Ink*—to the present mortification of the publishers of this advertising trade magazine, who are definitely *not* anti-Semitic. Gerald L. K. Smith's associates at one time included a couple of unfrocked preachers he found selling stock for brokerage houses, and one of them sued Smith for failing to divide the "take." When the advertising business slumped in the early thirties, and ad-man William Dudley Pelley lost his pill and gadget accounts, he got himself a revelation and began selling political shirts by methods not essentially different from those to which ordinary advertising practice had accustomed him. When Joe McWilliams found himself no longer wanted as a gadget salesman, he got himself a wide-brimmed Stetson and sold anti-Semitism from his covered wagon on the street corners of Yorkville. His Serviceman's Reconstruction Plan is lavishly printed and bound like a blue-sky oil-stock promotion and its pseudo-Marxist economic patter, seemingly picked up at the Workers' School, which he attended briefly, reads like a burlesque of Jay Lovestone.

The best-known American exploiter of the fundamentalist brand of Fuehrerism is the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, who

studied homiletics at Valparaiso College and Butler University. This swashbuckler has served as pitchman successively for Pelley, Talmadge, Long, Coughlin, and Old-Age Townsend, who fired him. At this writing he is in Los Angeles, allied with the Allen brothers, promoters of "Ham and Eggs," and engaged in working the same rich alluvial deposit of Middle Western fundamentalism, populism and crackpot money theologies that had been previously exploited by Phelps and the Reverend X.

American Fuehrer—Drama

THE most striking finding of the Institute's studies is the close similarity in method of the three demagogues whose speeches and broadcasts it has analyzed; this applies especially to the two West Coast agitators whose performances—considered as show business, which is what they are essentially—are as alike as a couple of travelling Tom-shows. Just as Hitler borrowed some of his propaganda methods from American advertising practice, so, in the formula used with minor modifications by the Reverend X, Phelps, and Joe McWilliams, there is evidence of considerable conscious or unconscious borrowing from Hitler and other European fascist agitators.

In the following composite version of this standardized Fuehrer-drama, it has been necessary to condense and simplify a good deal, thereby sacrificing the detailed subtlety of the Institute's analysis, while retaining the essential elements, which are always the same. Like all melodrama, the plot is based on the irreconcilable conflict between the forces of good and evil, with the villain forever pursuing and the hero always in danger, but assured of ultimate victory, given the ardent participation of the audience. As in Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*, the leading actor is also producer and stage manager, introducing the other characters and interpreting the action.

For the purpose of the drama it is essential that the hero be presented not as a superman or dictator, but as a plain democratic gallus-wearing American; he is bit-

terly persecuted by the totalitarian forces of evil so that while fighting bravely he is obliged to cry to us for help. (When fascism comes to America, said Huey Long, it will be presented as anti-fascism.)

One of the most crucified and persecuted individuals of this generation, according to his own platform declaration, is this same Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith. Hitler, you may remember, also complained that he was persecuted, but being a genuine paranoiac, he probably believed it to some extent. This modicum of sincerity made him much more effective than the cynical Gerald.

"Listen, my brother, my sister," declaimed the Reverend X in the early years of his broadcasting career, "With my right hand raised to God, I tell you that I hold no malice against any human being today, although I think there is no man in western America who has been more persecuted for the cause of Jesus Christ and truth and righteousness, and yet I don't hold a thing in my heart. I love the souls of all men."

So infatuated with his Christ-identification is the Reverend X that he stops just short of saying "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Often he prays for the souls of his persecutors. Then, shrewdly, he suggests that his hearers, who may be less prepared to turn the other cheek, may also suffer persecution: "Listen, Christians, do you remember that He said if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you."

The Rev. Phelps is especially adept at invoking the Christ-identification. He is poor, he sacrifices all for his mission. Humbly he accepts the "cross of death" under which he labors toward the resurrection of true Americanism. And like the Reverend X, he suggests that his followers too must expect to bear that cross.

Joe McWilliams is also persecuted, but the Christ-identification is not for him. "They can threaten me all they want to," he shouts. "I am not a damn bit afraid to walk the streets of New York all by myself. I don't have to. I have the toughest men in New York with me."

In his bid for followers the hero opens his heart and revels in personal intimacies. He is no God, but a plain fellow with human foibles, hopes, and worries—especially financial worries—like you and me. He is Joe McWilliams, the handsome, big-hearted “immigrant from Texas.” He is the Reverend X, who tells the Lord—being careful to be overheard by his radio audience—that he just can’t go on unless God sends him the money to pay a \$300 printing bill; later he confesses to his hearers that he “almost cried” when he got a \$50 contribution to his cause. He is George Allison Phelps, the solid Christian American husband and father, who has been obliged by stern duty and the spreading menace of the forces of subversion to leave his little white house with the blue roof, to take long railroad journeys and to spend lonely nights in dreary hotels.

Like Hitler, both of these West Coast agitators present themselves as indefatigable beyond the powers of ordinary men. This is an attribute of the hero’s dedicated role. His work is a labor of love. He doesn’t ask you to work as hard as he works.

Yet dedicated and indefatigable though he be, the hero is but the servant of his cause and of one far greater. (“Ich bin nur der Trommler,” said Hitler in his early years.) Thus the Reverend X:

“If this message I am giving today glorifies X—or any other human being, it is bound to fail, but if this message of the Great Christian American Crusade lifts up the Son of God, this movement is bound to succeed.”

“We don’t have much of a church here,” continues the Great Little Guy. “We don’t have any stained-glass windows. . . . But folks, we love Christ out here, and we are trying to serve him to the very best of our ability. If you are worn and tired of life and if you think that God does not love you, suppose you get out that old Bible of yours, that old Bible that you have loved and that has come down through the years. . . . Perhaps it belonged to that old father or mother of yours. Go get it, won’t you?”

(What a great little guy, sigh X’s listeners. Poor as a church-mouse, persecuted and threatened, but he won’t be stopped. A great little guy!)

Ever since the shattering economic and psychological catastrophe of the depression, this country has been full of little guys who would like to think of themselves as *great* little guys, but find it difficult to do so. America has given them very little to love during this period, and the resulting vacuum aches with the need of hating something or somebody.

The Fuehrer-drama, as enacted by Joe McWilliams and the two West Coast agitators, supplies both of these needs. It enables the little guy—man or woman—to identify himself with the Leader, who presents himself too as a little guy but a *great* little guy. The leader and, through him, the follower can at last respect himself and even love himself; for does not he too possess some of the Christ-attributes of long suffering and heroism in the fight against evil?

What evil? Who? Where?

The re-awakened self-respect of the little guy turns to combativeness. He wants to be shown the face of the enemy, and the great little guy at the microphone or on the platform obliges—in so far as he dares.

Let’s Hate the “Eskimos”

THE enemy is the “Eskimos,” said Joe McWilliams. Give power to that great little guy Joe McWilliams and you won’t see so many “Eskimo” faces in the bureaus at City Hall. (The applause at this point is as much for the accompanying mimicry as for the statement.) Instead there will be more Irish, Bohemian, Czech and Polish faces.

“I want to remind everybody of this fact,” shouts McWilliams. “That the Poles have been putting up a fight against the Eskimos a hundred years before Joe McWilliams started. . . . I came here for the same reason that you people came from Poland, from Czechoslovakia, from Ireland, from Italy, and from many spots of the globe because you thought that in New

York would be a magnificent opportunity for Christian people to develop a Christian civilization, and the reason for this fight is this: that the civilization of New York as it is led today is not a Christian civilization, it is an Asiatic civilization.

"We don't care whether you come from Italy or Czechoslovakia, or whether you come from Ireland or Wyoming, there is only one thing we want to know and that is this: Are you Christian and are you Aryan?"

The cat got out of the bag that time. Usually McWilliams, although an avowed admirer of Hitler, was careful at that period to stick to his "Eskimo" euphemism.

The West Coast fundamentalist anti-Semitic agitators were on the whole much less discreet.

"You have no conception," warned the Reverend X, "Unless you have been up against it as I and some of the rest of us have been, the extent and the length to which they will go to accomplish their purpose. They follow me around. They have half a dozen or a dozen constantly on my trail. Whenever I go to speak they try to cancel my engagements. They get hold of managers and radio stations—they have cancelled our contract that had two months to go, purely on the basis of one thing—Communist and radical and Jewish opposition to the Christian American crusade. . . .

"These denizens of hell and sons of Judas Iscariot have sworn that we and the Christian American Crusade is going to be put out of business within the next three months. I want you to know this. I told my family last night and I told them again today. I said I will never surrender, never change, I will go on and on and on until the end. It doesn't matter what comes or what goes and I want you Americans to stay with me in this battle until the truth and justice of Christ is triumphant. You will have plenty of opportunity during the months to come the way things are moving to die for the cause of Christ because it is certainly moving rapidly in that direction."

It is easy to imagine the response of X's

audience to this. "A great little guy. He told his family—didja hear him say that? No, he won't let them bluff him—the dirty——s."

George Allison Phelps too is a great little guy, and how he has suffered! The plots that these foul foreigners have contrived against him! The fiendish persecutions he has had to endure—decency forbids him to describe them precisely! But he can be pushed too far. In the end this imported Hollywood riff-raff will find itself up against the stone wall of the Great Little Guy's Yankee stubbornness. He'll hit back. He'll blow the lid off! He'll really become anti-something. He'll step on them—and hard!

Pogrom Revivalist

Note that the Great Little Guy lets himself go on occasion. It is a part of the act, just as it was a part of Hitler's act. Listen again to the Reverend X:

"You know I thank God that I am kind of turning loose of my heart the last three years. . . . Listen, Presbyterians and Episcopalians and all those schools of stoicism, turn loose of your heart. Oh I know how hard it is. You kind of feel like I do. You are afraid of fanaticism. There is a rightful place for the expression of love for God. You needn't be a fanatic. Remember what St. Augustine said one day, 'If you let heart go, you will toddle off to God.' Clap your hands just a little bit. Remember over yonder in the Old Testament where it says that the trees have clapped their hands for joy. . . . All of the earth is filled with the glory of the glory of the Lord. My, it is wonderful to know God, isn't it? It is wonderful to know the love of Christ."

Anyone who has ever attended a Holy Roller tent revival will recognize the intent and predictable effect of exhortations of this sort. The end-result is usually an emotional orgy. But it can also be, and sometimes is, a race riot. To quote directly from the Institute's analysis:

As soon as the barriers against crying and self-pity are broken down, one may express unchecked one's suppressed feelings of hatred

and fury as well, and the collective religious hysteria of the Holy Rollers may be consummated by the pogrom. Moreover, the more the barriers of self-control within the listeners are broken down by the orator's encouragement, the more easily they are subjected to his will rather than to their own. . . .

It has often been pointed out that fascism feeds upon the lack of emotional gratification in an industrial society and that it grants to the people that irrational satisfaction which is denied to them by today's social and economic setup. . . .

Tricks of the Trade

IN ITS analyses of the broadcasts and speeches of the Reverend X, George Allison Phelps, and Joe McWilliams, the Institute identifies and describes nearly half a hundred demagogic tricks and devices, among them the following:

The "lone wolf" device, by which the agitator, who usually has some backing from reactionary individuals and groups, dramatizes himself as an independent, foot-loose crusader.

The nostalgic glamorization of the "good old times" before the detested refugees and "Eskimos" appeared on the scene.

The flight-of-ideas technique whereby, as in an advertisement written to evade the curbs of the Federal Trade Commission, ideas having no logical connection are tied together by repeated verbal association. Thus the sound of a hoarse-voiced foghorn reminds you illogically, but effectively, to buy a particular kind of bath soap; similarly, the Reverend X's most un-Christian harangues recruit followers for his "Crusade"—a movement that reputable Protestant and Catholic churchmen view with alarm and detestation.

The emotional release device, as illustrated by the Reverend X's appeal to "turn loose of your heart." Knowing that many people in our mechanized industrial society are emotionally starved and frustrated, the agitator undertakes deliberately to break down taboos on irrational behavior and to make attitudes of hysteria socially acceptable.

The "movement" that moves nowhere.

Characteristically, fascist and anti-Semitic agitators leave you in the dark concerning their objectives. Thus the Reverend X calls upon his followers to "demonstrate to the world that there are patriotic, God-fearing Christian men and women who are yet willing to give their lives for the cause of God, home and native land." But how and where is this cause endangered? And what would the Fuehrer have us do about it? The Reverend X does not say. He merely fans excitement, and calls for "action"—in short, sets the stage for a pogrom.

The familiar "amalgam" device by which all liberals are smeared as Communists, just as Communist propagandists denounce all critics of Stalin as "Trotskyists," assassins of the pen, fascist agents of Hitler and Hearst, etc., etc.

The "democratic cloak" trick. Here the agitator makes much of "our ancient liberties" and hides his own totalitarian aims by posing as the defender of embattled democracy against the assaults of its conspiratorial foes, the Communists and the "Eskimos."

The exaltation of "unity." In our confused and atomized society, any suggestion that unity is to be had is likely to be welcomed. But the unity offered by our native fascist agitators, like that of the Nazis, is highly exclusive. The foreigner is outside. "Those evil forces"—Communists, radicals, skeptics, Jews—are condemned and driven away.

The "cleanliness" obsession. Americans hate dirt and disease and worship cleanliness and health—witness the omnipresence of these themes in magazine advertisements and radio commercials. Seizing upon this obsession the agitator fills his mouth with the language of the health fanatic. The nation must be purged and fumigated before the agitator and his friends can live in cleanliness and health.

Many of these devices appear regularly in the arsenals of fascist agitators both here and abroad. By recognizing them one is enabled to identify the type. It remains true, however, that even after you have added

all these and other devices together, you still don't get the inimitable come-on, spiel and pitch of the Reverend X, or George Allison Phelps, or Joe McWilliams. Even the sorriest of these third-string agitators regularly transcends in action the sum total of the tricks he employs. Style is the man, whether one is talking about a cheap shouter like Gerald L. K. Smith, or a near-genius like Huey Long; about Rudyard Kipling or Robert W. Service, about Joe Louis or some battered ten-dollar-a-fight pug.

Folk Remedy for Fuehrers

JUST as the sanitarian is careful to base his control measures upon an accurate knowledge of the actual or potential infections of the health environment, so an effective defense against our native Fuehrers and their more or less infectious folk dramas must be based on a realistic understanding of what we are dealing with. Obviously it makes no sense to flit these social pests with precisely the kind of spray on which they thrive. To chase them off the air, break up their meetings, dig up the dirt in their pasts—all such measures can easily result in building up the prestige of these sleazy vaudevillians in their self-elected roles as "martyrs."

A safer and in the end a more effective tactic is to work with the grain of the American folk habit. To balance our susceptibility to the wiles of social and political nostrum salesmen, we have, as a people, substantial assets of folk sanity and shrewdness. We do not suffer fools gladly—not all of us, all the time. And we suffer phonies not at all when we can spot them, as we usually can, given a little time.

That there is ample shrewd insight in native America upon which to build was demonstrated to this writer when in the spring of 1935 he, with several other New York journalists, went to Louisiana to cover the provincial try-out of Huey Long's proto-fascist *Share-the-Wealth* drama. In New Orleans there were many who understood the essential histrionism of the phenomenon. A veteran politician said:

"Huey is just a Winn Parish boy who

came to the big town and put on an act, and then another act, until by now doggone if he ain't just about the biggest show in America."

In the backwoods of Winn Parish a country doctor who had known three generations of Longs snorted contemptuously and said:

"Huey is just a bad actor. He's a no-good and always was. A show-off. When he was a kid in high school he'd debate on any side of a subject. A bully, too, he'd always run like a turkey when anybody called his bluff."

In America there is always a good chance that the faker—whether in politics, in the arts, or in the sciences—can be overwhelmed by an exudation of ridicule and contempt in which he is encysted and made helpless. What, for example, became of Alexander Dowie and Wilbur Glenn Voliva? Of Coué? Of Father Divine? What was it that finally broke the *Dearborn Independent* if not the skeptical resistance of the American folk to the humorless fanaticism of Henry Ford and his anti-Semitic aides?

Time and again this writer has seen street-corner agitators thrown into a tailspin by some dead-pan heckler who, disdaining argument, has exposed the phoniness of the speaker by persistent burlesque and mimicry. The more insincere the agitator—and our contemporary anti-Semites are notably weak at that point—the more vulnerable he is to such handling.

And for handling them the Institute's studies, once translated into the vernacular of the street, will provide excellent ammunition.

All such measures, however, comprise so to speak the social therapy of anti-Semitism. They do not reach the causes of the infection, which are primarily economic, as the Institute's admirable studies of the history of anti-Semitism in Germany clearly show.

A more fundamental defense-in-depth against the spread of the Fuehrer-drama from areas of low social resistance like Los Angeles, Detroit, and Chicago into the national body politic will be found in a pro-

gram of *prevention*, based on the progressive removal of the economic tensions and insecurities of which social hysteria is a natural concomitant. In politics as in medicine, quackery rushes in where honest science fears—or fails—to tread. Because we permitted a stalemated relief economy to sputter along on three cylinders during the thirties, involving special hardships for old people, we got the Townsend Plan and "Ham and Eggs." Because our present plans for re-employing and rehabilitating the vet-

erans of this war are vague and inadequate, Joe McWilliams makes a little hay with his "Serviceman's Reconstruction Program."

A sound prescription for the cure and prevention of anti-Semitism is easy to write, hard to fill. It is a postwar America united by an all-out commitment to the use, for the ends of peace, of the magnificent productivity we have demonstrated in war. That would provide drama enough for everybody. There would be no audiences for Fuehrer shows.

NEXT STEPS AFTER THE CHARTER

An Approach to the Enforcement of Human Rights

PERCY E. CORBETT

THE current drive for human rights began to gather strength in the early days of World War II. It was allied with the drive for an international organization that would be powerful enough to stop war. In the flood of designs for world-government that began pouring out in 1940, codes and agencies for enhancing and safeguarding the liberty and the dignity of man as man have taken prominent place.

This movement, which in a few years has become broad and powerful, has drawn together and revived initiatives that reach far back into the past. Its fountain-head is the age-old aspiration to equality for all men; its tributaries are the historic revolts against tyranny that have left their record in declarations and bills of rights. Chief among the forces that have swollen it of late has been an accumulating world-wide indignation over the torture and butchery of opposition elements and scape-goat minorities in the Axis countries.

Moral and emotional reaction against barbaric inhumanity has been reinforced by

THE movement for the development of effective international machinery for the protection of minorities and of human beings generally will be a continuing concern of COMMENTARY. Initiating the discussion in these pages, we present an appraisal of recent advances, together with a proposal of a step-by-step priorities plan to enforce and implement the Charter's provisions on human rights. The author, Prof. PERCY S. CORBETT, is chairman of the Department of Political Science and a member of the Institute of International Studies at Yale University. He served with the late League of Nations from 1920 to 1924, as a member of the League Secretariat and of the International Labor Office Legal Service in Geneva. Canadian-born, he is the author of *Canada and World Politics* and *Post-War Worlds*.

intellectual calculation touching the conditions and the ultimate purpose of more lasting peace. Wars spring from human discontents. Among these discontents there are always basic grievances. To reduce these grievances must be to weaken the forces making for war. And even if peace could be kept between nations without making any direct attempt to improve the position of the individual, there would be little profit if, within the nation, men were left subject to oppression and exploitation. It would be hardly worth while to deliver man from the curse of war if he is to suffer still the curse of tyranny and want.

This is the reasoning that finds its latest and highest confirmation in the Preamble of the United Nations Charter. There, following immediately after the bold statement of determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" comes the assertion of "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person." There, too, immediately after the purpose of a just and firm legal order in the community of states, stands the purpose "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." The long struggle to win for the individual freedom and means for the full development of his capacities has thus entered a new phase and taken on a new dimension. Its front becomes as broad as the world, and it shares with the peace-objective the collective energies of the United Nations.

Past Gains to Build On

PREPARING the way for this general advance, many fragmentary gains have already been secured. Only the confirmed pessimist denies that the average lot of the indi-

vidual has substantially improved since the eighteenth century. Due allowance made for vast areas where the increase of population has kept standards of living as low as they were two hundred years ago, and for sharp temporary aberrations in countries described as "advanced," the over-all movement has been towards larger freedom and enhanced welfare. Even totalitarian governments, making the individual a means of national greatness rather than an end in himself, have been obliged to pay careful attention to the condition of that means. As for liberal, democratic regimes, they long ago abandoned *laissez-faire* principles in favor of active intervention to safeguard the citizen against exploitation and privation.

The progress made up to the present in securing the individual against arbitrary and oppressive measures of private or public origin, and against destitution, has been achieved mainly through national legislation and administration. The American and French bills of rights of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, like their English prototypes, were designed to set limits to the invasion of private liberties and interests by public authorities, and to establish the individual's part in the political process. Some of the early crusaders for human rights were fully aware of the importance of "economic liberty," and already in 1793 the French Declaration of Rights recognized the duty of the state to provide either work or subsistence. Towards the end of the nineteenth century social insurance began to find a place in national constitutions. This provision is frequently found in twentieth-century fundamental laws, where it is sometimes accompanied by the guarantee of useful employment. Equality of emphasis on economic and political rights is one distinct characteristic of the contemporary as contrasted with earlier campaigns for the enlargement of individual liberties and opportunities. A second is a shift from national to international agencies in proposed methods of achievement.

The appeal to authority over and above

the state to secure individual rights is of course far from new. In legal and political discussion from the days of Aristotle to our own times, man, as such, has been described as endowed by "natural law" with certain inalienable attributes. The "law of nature," often identified partially or completely with "divine law," has been said to impose upon monarchs and governments an inescapable obligation to respect and defend a group of rights (varying from writer to writer and from time to time) alleged to belong to every man by virtue merely of his humanity. All the positivistic and analytical jurisprudence of the nineteenth century was unable to eradicate, though for a time it overshadowed, this notion of a higher law not made by States. Within the last twenty-five years, eminent jurists have set themselves the task of reinvigorating this notion. Some, indeed, have undertaken to convince the world of lawyers that natural law is no mere notion, no mere moral standard by which to gauge the justice of national legislation, but a real, imperative and basic part of all legal systems.

The contemporary movement will doubtless continue to invoke the age-long doctrine of natural law in support of its demands for fuller and less fragile human rights. No one who wishes the movement well will begrudge it any respect and support that it may win by this reference to universal and supreme reason, whatever he may think of the nature of "natural law." But we now know beyond all doubt that something less vague and intangible than "natural law" is needed to secure national compliance with any general standard of liberties and opportunities for the individual.

Versailles and After

THE new thing in the contemporary movement is the effort to establish a universal bill of rights as part of international law, and to organize internationally for its enforcement. Traces of this shift may be found in the nineteenth-century doctrines of "humanitarian intervention," which sought to justify action (including the use of force, if necessary) by foreign governments to pre-

vent any state from treating inhumanly its minorities. But the systematic development begins with the treaties following the last war. The minorities treaties, and Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles establishing the International Labor Organization, mark the characteristic direction of the new effort.

The minorities treaties bound only new states formed as a result of the war, and were designed to benefit only racial, linguistic and religious minorities. They were occasioned by the disapproval, in the Allied countries, of the political, civil and cultural discrimination long suffered in various parts of Europe by groups differing in one or more of the three particulars mentioned from the ruling majority in the state to which they were subject. Such discrimination was regarded not only as an offense to the conscience of mankind, but as a danger to peace. The treaties stipulated equality of treatment for the minorities, and assigned to the Council of the League of Nations the duty of securing their fulfillment.

In some important cases the minorities system under the League was able to alleviate oppression. In others it clearly failed. Its failure may be traced partly to defects in machinery which gave the minorities wholly inadequate means of bringing their grievances before the Council, and which left in doubt the Council's collective responsibility for supervision and action. But these defects could have been remedied in a flourishing organization for peace. The weakness of the minorities system was essentially just one aspect of the general weakness of the League. That fact is significant for the future. It suggests an intimate connection between the fortunes of a universal bill of rights and those of an international organization.

In another segment of the human-rights front, that of labor conditions, the treaties following World War I laid the groundwork for another and more successful advance. Article 23 of the Covenant bound the members of the League of Nations to "endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women,

and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend." For this purpose the members undertook to "establish and maintain the necessary international organizations." To carry out these obligations, the International Labor Organization was created by Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles.

The Constitution of the International Labor Organization did not contain any code of labor law. In its first sentence it proclaims the dependence of peace upon social justice and cites the existence of labor conditions which involve so much injustice and hardship that they imperil the harmony of nations. Among its guiding principles, it declares that labor should not be regarded "merely as a commodity or article of commerce," that employed as well as employers should have the right of association for all lawful purposes, and that wages should be paid "adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life." Only a general program is sketched, enumerating such objectives as the regulation of hours of labor, stability of employment, social security, an adequate living wage, freedom of association, and vocational education. The rest of the Constitution is given over to the machinery and methods by which these objectives are to be reached.

Implementing these briefly stated principles and program, the International Labor Organization bit by bit over a period of twenty years elaborated an extensive labor code which has found acceptance in many countries. Undeterred by conditions that might have been expected to paralyze it, the Organization continued its work throughout the war. Its Conference at Philadelphia in 1944 adopted a Declaration which expands its original function and asserts its resolve to participate, without limitation to labor conditions, in the general drive for fuller individual liberties and rights.

It is imperative for those engaged in the promotion of human rights to study the record, the methods, and the plans of the International Labor Organization. This has been and will be one of the most effective

agencies working in the field, and the procedures by which it has won its objectives in the past hold many a lesson for the proposed United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Toward Positive Human Rights

Two chains of events explain the sudden prominence of private rights in peace aims after the outbreak of World War II. One of these—the treatment of Jews and of opposition elements in Fascist countries and the horror that spread around the world over these barbarities—has already been mentioned. The other was the long series of economic catastrophes which, from 1930 on, carried unemployment, destitution, and demoralization far and wide among the nations. As the war drew in more and more countries, it came to be described as a struggle for a world in which the individual would have more safety, more freedom, and more food. President Roosevelt's message to Congress in January, 1941, with its "Four Freedoms" (of worship, of speech, from want, from fear) caught the imagination of the peoples fighting Nazism as nothing else had. In the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, and the Declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, these aims became a part of the common covenant of the States aligned against the Axis. From that point, through the Teheran Declaration of December 1, 1943, and the Dumbarton Oaks text of October 9, 1944, up to the Charter of the United Nations signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, the line of progression is clear.

The development was not suspended to wait for implementation of the Charter. There is a heartening pertinacity and consistency in the official championship of human rights by the principal Allied Powers. The conditions laid down for Germany by the Berlin Conference on August 2, 1945, call for the repeal of all Nazi laws which "established discrimination on grounds of race, creed or political opinion," for the abolition of such discrimination, and for the reorganization of the judicial system "in accordance with the principles of democracy,

of justice under law, and of equal rights for all citizens without distinction of race, nationality, or religion."

The terms offered to Japan by the United States, Great Britain, and China from Potsdam on July 26, 1945, require the Japanese government to "remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights, shall be established."

Such, in broad outline, are the history and character of the movement for human rights. Some victories in detail have been won, the new universal objectives have been officially stated, and official plans have been laid for an organization to direct what is now regarded as one of the principal tasks of the United Nations. How can this organization do most to guard men and women, wherever they need guarding, from a repetition of the cruelty and the want which have been the lot of so many in the last decade?

Where do we go from here?

Inadequacies of the Charter

"HUMAN rights," "fundamental freedoms," and "better standards of life" are familiar terms in the San Francisco Charter. They occur in the Preamble, and in Articles 1, 13, 55, 62, 68, and 76. But they are not defined. Nowhere does the document say bluntly that all members shall see to it that their peoples have freedom of speech and religion. Much of the text is devoted to organization designed to prevent war and so to lighten man's burden of fear, or designed to develop industry and trade and so to relieve him of want; but President Roosevelt's freedom from fear and freedom from want do not appear in so many words. Neither is any elaborate machinery set up for the specific enforcement of human rights. There is, indeed, no word of enforcement.

The Charter, then, contains no bill, declaration, or code of human rights, and sets up little or nothing of that system of courts and police on which—at least in democratic countries—we rely so heavily for safety and

freedom. Some hoped that the Conference would promulgate a code, and various elaborate lists of rights, some with appropriate plans of enforcement, were communicated to it. The Conference, wisely I think, refused to go into detail.

What it did was firmly to enshrine the promotion of human rights among the principal purposes of the United Nations. Whether the text quite satisfies the draftsmen of the Philadelphia Declaration, who wanted this to be "the central aim of national and international policy," hardly matters; for, as no straight boundary line can be drawn between measures to keep the peace and measures to promote fundamental rights, so no consistent priority can be assigned to either. They are different facets of the same general problem.

Having proclaimed the purpose, the Conference made it a duty of the General Assembly of the United Nations to "initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of . . . promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. . . ." Turning to Article 62, we find that the same function is assigned to the Economic and Social Council. Further on, in Article 68, the Economic and Social Council is instructed to set up a commission "for the promotion of human rights." Finally, in Article 76, a duty to promote the rights and liberties of the individual, this time in relation to the populations of "trust territories," is laid upon the Trusteeship System, the specific agency here being the Trusteeship Council operating under the General Assembly.

At first glance, these arrangements appear disjointed and overlapping. In practice they can be expected to fall into a pretty clear pattern. The "prime mover" in the works should be the commission set up by the Economic and Social Council. Let us call it the "Commission on Human Rights." It will be responsible to the Economic and Social Council which in turn is responsible to the General Assembly. The Trusteeship

Council is instructed (Article 91) to collaborate with the Economic and Social Council and is itself responsible to the General Assembly (Article 85).

Holding the whole machinery together, then, and supervising its operation, is the General Assembly. But the one body whose special and total function is the promotion of human rights is the Commission, and upon this body should fall the primary task of advising on policy, proposing and drafting measures, and examining reports. How will the Commission operate?

A Bill of Rights?

ONE of the first decisions of the Commission ought to be whether or not it should draft a general statement of human rights. If it favors a general statement, it will then immediately have to decide whether this should take the form of a universal code which all States would be invited to adopt and enforce, or of a mere declaration of principles which the members of the United Nations might agree to implement as speedily as the particular circumstances of each member would permit.

A good many people think it obvious that a universal code should be established at once. In an interesting and persuasive book Professor Lauterpacht gives his powerful support to this view. More than that, he provides a draft which will merit careful study by the Commission on Human Rights. The book was written before the San Francisco Conference, and the author recommended that the "Council of the United Nations" should be "the supreme agency for securing the observance of the International Bill of the Rights of Man," and that the Council should take any necessary political, economic, or military action if any State persisted in violation of the Bill.

The San Francisco Charter does not assign to the Security Council any specific function in the matter of human rights. Nor has the General Assembly any powers of enforcement. The Security Council is indeed empowered to take such economic or political action "as may be necessary to maintain or

restore international peace and security" (Articles 41-42), and this provision might well come into operation in cases where the invasion of individual rights constituted a threat to the peace. But Professor Lauterpacht, I fear, goes too fast and too far. His proposals would defeat his own ends. A code offering the civic, social, and economic rights which his does, and backed by all the sanctions in the Security Council's arsenal, would frighten off many States, even some with relatively high standards of liberty and welfare. There is little prospect that anything at once so comprehensive and so compulsory would in any near future rally the general consent necessary to make it law.

There would be more chance of success if we were content to leave out rights to work, to social security, to education, and to a democratic system of government, confining ourselves to the more familiar negative rights such as freedom of speech and religion, freedom from arbitrary arrest and retroactive laws, and freedom from discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or sex. These are termed "negative" because they call mainly for abstentions rather than for positive action on the part of governments, whereas work, social security, education, and democracy impose upon the State a duty of elaborate planning and administration. The negative rights have the advantage also of making no direct addition to State budgets. But in this fifth decade of the twentieth century, after two world wars and the intervening catastrophe of economic depression, a bill of rights so limited would be of interest chiefly to antiquarians. It would altogether fail to satisfy the demand which activates the present drive.

A Declaration of Rights?

SUPPOSING, then, that the Commission on Human Rights were to conclude that any code which would at present win general acceptance would be regarded rather as mockery than as satisfaction—should it favor the alternative of a statement of principles to which all members of the United Nations could subscribe? Such a statement could in-

clude all the social, economic, and political objectives of the contemporary champions of human rights, in addition to what we may call the "classical freedoms" aimed at in earlier phases of the movement. In content, then, it would satisfy the current demand. Its weakness would be its lack of compulsory quality. The total obligation of the subscribing countries would be to make a serious effort to bring the stated rights into practice. "Serious effort" is an elusive standard, difficult to apply anywhere, but especially so in the international field.

Despite this weakness, the idea of a general statement has many advocates. These emphasize the advantages of a known goal, and the moral influence of great principles officially promulgated. They cite the long, benign development of the constitutional law of the United States and of Britain under the inspiration of historic declarations which in the beginning were nothing more than broad and unsanctioned generalizations.

If the Commission on Human Rights finds these considerations conclusive, it can draw upon a considerable volume of preparatory work in drafting its general statement. What Professor Lauterpacht presents as an International Bill of Rights might with minor alterations serve as the text of a less compulsory International Declaration. The report on the problem issued in 1944 by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace will be a useful contribution. Certainly the Commission should consider the "Statement of Essential Human Rights" drafted on the initiative of the American Law Institute and circulated by Americans United for World Organization, Inc. The American Law Institute's committee was made up of persons drawn from American, European, and Asiatic cultures, and its work therefore can lay claim to a basis broader than the thought and ideals of one civilization. It proceeded in full knowledge of the provisions concerning individual rights incorporated in national constitutions, and the voluminous documentation collected and digested for this purpose could doubtless be made available to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Yet it remains debatable whether a general statement should be promulgated. Because it would be devoid of strict legal authority and unsupported by specific procedures of enforcement, the comparison between its theoretical perfection and the shortcomings of national performance might engender disillusionment. The common man, for whose benefit the whole enterprise is intended, would probably think of the stated principles as rights or nothing. "Objectives," "ideals," or "standards" not translated into enforceable rights would give him little satisfaction.

The Commission on Human Rights will doubtless understand that its purpose is not a neatly rounded job, but the substantial advancement of individual liberties and opportunities. It will therefore have to consider carefully whether it can do most for living human beings by setting up an ideal statement of rights at which all States can aim, or by concentrating its energies *seriatim* on securing the actual application of specific rights selected one after the other by reference both to their urgency and their possibility. Conceivably it might combine the two methods, stating all its objectives first and then proceeding piece-meal to their achievement. For the reasons indicated in the preceding paragraph, I am inclined to believe that it will be wiser to proceed, as the International Labor Organization has done, without setting up in advance any general statement in the form either of code or of declaration of principles and objectives.

A Program of Priorities

It **WILL** be quite possible for the Commission on Human Rights to work out an order of priority in its program. If we were thinking primarily of present needs, we should put economic rights at the very top of the list. Immediate postwar relief is the imperative task of the moment, and the effort now being devoted to it is surely a convincing demonstration of the whole world's concern in the economic plight of the individual everywhere. But this is the business of other agencies. The task of the Commission on Human Rights is a long-term task.

It might profitably take as the first focus of its attention the matter of race discrimination. There is something like official unanimity of opposition to this species of primitive prejudice. Few governments would dare to reject an agreement aiming at effective control. The San Francisco Charter may itself be regarded as a convention to abolish discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or sex. But this carries us little beyond the establishment of the principle of equality, and meanwhile, from many parts of Europe and America, come substantiated reports of resurgent race-hatred. A strong case can be made out on grounds of peace and humanity alike for an immediate and determined attack on this problem. It would then be clear from the outset that every right subsequently established belongs at once to all, without distinction of blood.

Whether or not religious discrimination should be attacked at the same time is a tactical question for the Commission. Its abolition cannot be distinguished from freedom of religion. It should not be taken for granted, because the San Francisco Charter lumps together discriminations on grounds of race, religion, and sex, that prevention is equally urgent in all three or that the task is indivisible in terms of immediate feasibility.

After the onslaught on racial discrimination, the Commission might attack arbitrary arrest and imprisonment. Coupled with freedom from these types of administrative tyranny is the right to speedy and fair trial. Any success in securing these benefits will *pro tanto* destroy the underpinnings of absolutism.

Following closely in order of priority would come the freedom to hold and communicate opinions. Like fair trial and freedom from arbitrary detention, the freedom of opinion and speech is incompatible with Nazism. Both items are essential steps in the establishment of democracy. Both, because of the close relation between absolutism and aggression, may claim high priority in the interests of international security as well as for their importance to the dignity and development of human personality.

Only after it has made good progress in the tasks already mentioned should the Commission undertake the direct promotion of democratic political organization. Why this delay, it may be asked, when the United States and Britain are already insisting on free elections in Poland, Bulgaria, and Greece? The answer is that when the Commission reaches this stage in its work it will be concerned not merely with countries which we have defeated in war or liberated from enemy occupation, where the vigorous supervision of restorative processes is therefore to be expected, but with all countries. There are among the United Nations countries with magnificently democratic constitutions where the citizen has no effective part in government and no protection against the abuse of authority. It will be difficult enough, as a first step, to secure for the individual in these countries the primary liberties of the person without attempting the complete and immediate reform of their entire systems of government.

As for the economic and social demands to work, social security, and education, few if any countries, even among those which have reached the highest standards of living, have yet transformed all of these into enforceable rights. The way to their general realization will be long and difficult. Here, moreover, the Commission will be wise to recommend a delegation of function. For more than twenty years the International Labor Organization carried on successful work in the broad field of conditions of employment. There is no other international agency so well qualified by organization and experience for the tremendous enterprise of securing for the individual the highest stability of employment and the highest degree of freedom from want that the economic resources of his country can provide. Much of its success will depend on that of other agencies, such as those planned in the Bretton Woods agreements and the Food and Agriculture Organization; but here surely is the instrumentality best fitted to provide that the benefits of these new institutions reach down to the individual all over the world.

In the matter of education, a specialized international agency is in process of creation. The Commission on Human Rights will, it is to be expected, work through this agency in any attempt to broaden the educational opportunities of the individual. But here again, when the question is one of vocational training, full use should be made of the knowledge and experience already gained by the International Labor Organization.

Wherever the Commission believes it wise to draft a convention, careful provision should be made for international action against States in default. An essential part of this will be a right of petition by individuals or groups to the Commission itself. But in order to make sure that the right to petition is actually available, the Commission will need a staff of field investigators. Only when the work of such investigators is regarded in all countries not as an offense, but as a matter of course, shall we have a reliable international system of human rights. It will not be easy to reach this point. Protests of outraged sovereignty and of invasion of domestic jurisdiction will bar the way. But if the San Francisco Charter has not taken the liberties of the individual out of the exclusive realm of domestic jurisdiction, then its high-sounding principles will indeed remain a mockery.

What shall the penalties be? These we must leave for the Commission to work out in suitable form and proportion for each of its conventions. But no doubt should be left that where the whole process of elaborating and ratifying a convention has been completed, and a State party persistently violates its obligations, any sanction available to the United Nations, and necessary to secure compliance, will be brought to bear.

As the system is developed, it is inevitable that many difficult legal questions touching the interpretation and application of conventions will present themselves. The highest tribunal of the United Nations should, and doubtless will, be open for adjudication. Probably, in the conventions themselves, the parties will agree to compulsory jurisdiction for this purpose. Under the constitution of

the International Labor Organization members accepted in advance the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in complaints arising out of non-fulfillment of their obligations. Unfortunately Article 34 of the Statute of the new International Court of Justice, repeating a rule in the Statute of the previous World Court, declares that "Only States may be parties in cases before the Court." This means that no injured individual or group may summon an opposing State before this tribunal. Only another State can do this.

This is merely one manifestation of the doctrine, which still prevails among governments, that the individual as such is not a subject of international law. A great deal of respect is due to the view that the International Court of Justice should not be besieged with frivolous complaints. To allow this to happen might be bad for the Court and bad for any prospective international system of human rights. It might therefore be expedient to prohibit access to the Court save with the approval of a State or the Commission on Human Rights. The rule might even be that every case brought before the Court must be conducted by a State or by the Commission. But the effective international enforcement of individual rights must inevitably, I believe, involve the recognition of the individual as the party before the Court.

Proceedings before international tribunals arising out of injuries to individuals have been bedeviled in the past by confusion between the State, as the legal party, and the individual who actually suffered the wrong and for whom compensation is sought. The theory which regards the State alone as subject of rights and duties assessable by an international court would make it logically necessary to consider exclusively the injury done to the State by the wrong which its national has suffered. Amongst other absurd artificialities which this legalism has imposed on the proceedings, has been a totally irrational measure of compensation and penalties. Arbiters have been on the one hand unwilling to limit their awards to the largely imaginary sufferings of that abstract entity, the State, and on the other unable to break clean away from the legal tradition and adapt the compensation to the needs of the human victim.

Surely it is safe to predict that, in cases where it becomes necessary to carry to an international court the injuries suffered by men and women through violation by their State of rights internationally guaranteed, this kind of artificiality will not long be endured. Let complaints, if they must, be filtered through State or Commission; but once they have reached court, let it be clear that the judges are dealing with living flesh, not with intellectual abstractions.

THE MONTH IN HISTORY

The Balance Sheet

IN THE summer of 1945, history was closing old chapters with explosive finality and opening new ones with a flourish.

Benito Mussolini was lynched, Adolf Hitler disappeared, Hirohito gave up: the greatest war in history came to an end.

The most solemn effort to build a lasting peace began:

The form of an international organization was put on paper.

For the first time, in a major and highly industrialized nation, socialists won a clear majority and took full power peacefully.

The simple Einsteinian concept—energy equals the mass times the square of the velocity of light—emerged from formula to the most revolutionary physical fact of all time.

But the road to the new world was deeply rutted: The international organization masked a big power alliance. The socialists with the majority were a minority in their Empire. And the potentialities, both for construction and destruction, of $E=mc^2$ made the terms in which current issues were discussed unreal; they even outmoded Utopias.

Below the global level, most of the problems men faced before the summer of great events, remained. The workers who helped

to free the atom's energy had been segregated on the basis of the color of their skins. The common man, standing on the threshold of his century, was in some places quite sure of a job and in others pretty sure of his freedom; nowhere was he really sure of both. Where the common man was a Jew he was likely to be especially unsure.

The Curtain Lifts

WHAT was left of the Jews in Europe?

It could be put arithmetically. In 1939 there had been six million Jews outside the Soviet Union. By the summer of 1945, 4,750,000 of them were dead.

By examining the condition of the 1,250,000 survivors, it was possible to give human content to the arithmetic.

There were survivors in the Mauthausen camp in Austria, where Nazi scientists used inmates as guinea pigs in poison-gas experiments. Mauthausen's survivors were so crazed by fear, they were afraid of freedom and wanted to remain in the familiar terror of the camp.

There were also survivors in Dachau. Some of them were children of fifteen who had spent one-third of their lives in Dachau. They had tuberculosis in their lungs; it was not readily apparent what they had in their minds and hearts.

The war at its most furious had swept back and forth over that area of the world containing the largest concentration of Jews. It was the largest concentration because the Czars had once designated most of it as a restricted place of settlement for the Jews. This fact had made it more convenient to kill the Jews; it was not why they killed. They were killed because they were Jews.

The survivors found themselves alive in a Europe in which no nation would officially support barbaric anti-Semitic persecution. This fact restored faith in the possibility of a civilized existence. But it was also a Europe in which the unofficial and devious

"THE MONTH IN HISTORY," a chronicle in perspective of significant developments in world events as they affect Jewish problems and activities, will be conducted by SIDNEY HERTZBERG, who has been dealing professionally with the raw material of history for more than fifteen years. He has been a foreign correspondent for *The New York Times*, associate editor of *Current History*, contributing editor of *Time* and editor of *Common Sense*. As a special correspondent for *The New York Times* in Scandinavia he wrote, in the *Times* of November 19, 1933, the first story about Vidkun Quisling. Mr. Hertzberg, who was born in the Yorkville section of New York City, attended the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin.

type of anti-Semitism was no less—some thought it worse—than it had ever been.

The Europe in which the survivors found themselves had been divided between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies, and between the two sections there was very little communication. The face of the Continent was boiling with people on the move—soldiers, ex-soldiers, widows, sick children, wild children. Not all of them were victims of the war. Millions were victims of the peace. For, to the millions who had been uprooted by the Nazis, were added millions of Germans uprooted by the Poles, Russians and Czechs. Everywhere men were being forced to go where they didn't want to go or prevented from going where they did want to go. Everywhere men had good reason for searing hatreds. Everywhere men, women and children were starving.

In Europe's places of power, laws and decrees were being abrogated and promulgated to ensure legal justice to the surviving Jews. It was comparatively painless to restore a Jew's citizenship and civil rights. It was not easy to return his property. Some non-Jews had acquired stolen Jewish property without knowing it. Others who were holding Jewish property in trust were reluctant to make a major economic readjustment. In the midst of the economic chaos and easily aroused anti-Semitism of postwar Europe, property restitution to the Jews was a highly inflammatory procedure.

Those responsible for administering immediate relief from starvation and disease had anticipated the difficulties that would be presented by Europe's physical chaos. They had not foreseen the problems created by the boon of equality. The equality to which Europe's Jews were restored included the right to be treated without discrimination by official relief agencies. As a result, though the Jews were usually the most destitute of the destitute, nothing special was done for them by these agencies. In Vienna, Austrian Jews who had suffered under the Nazis because they were Jews, were now suffering under the Russians because they were—without discrimination—Austrians. In Soviet-occupied Germany only Jews sent to concentration camps for political reasons were given the special rations set aside for "victims of fascism."

Most of the 100,000 Jews found in the western zones of occupied Germany were displaced. Five months after the Nazi capitulation, these displaced Jews were still living behind the barbed wire of the same concentration camps in which they had been imprisoned and tortured by the Nazis. The problem was not easy. In camps containing both Jews and non-Jews of a particular nation, special relief measures just for the Jews would have aroused anti-Semitic feeling. Indeed, in some mixed Polish camps the question was not special measures for Jews; it was still getting equal treatment for Jews.

The policy of the military administration was to treat all Jews, regardless of origin, as displaced persons; but the policy was widely disregarded in the actual administration of the camps. UNRRA, over the objections of the Soviet Union, Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, decided to continue to help displaced persons in Germany who did not want to return to their former homes. Emigration was discouraged by all officials—especially British. But all observers agreed that most displaced Jews were quite clear on where they wanted to go: practically anywhere outside Europe.

To supplement the military and UNRRA, the Joint Distribution Committee sent supplies, relief workers and money into all corners of Europe. The European director of JDC was allowed to enter Poland. In Western Germany, six JDC teams, each consisting of 34 specialists, tried to meet the worst problems ever thrust at a social worker.

How many Jews in a particular locality survived was more than a statistical question. Virtually every Jew in Europe had been displaced. The number of Jews actually found in some city did not necessarily bear any relation to the number of Jews originally from that city who were still alive. Of the one-quarter of Europe's Jews who survived, a higher proportion were residents of Western Europe. But until every Jew was returned home and all non-repatriables were accounted for, the fate of specific Jewish communities could not be determined.

That all European Jews who wanted to leave should be able to obtain exit visas and transportation to Palestine was a measure on which practically all Jewish groups in the world—Zionist, non-Zionist and anti-

Zionist—were agreed. But unanimity on this immediate humanitarian move emphasized the dilemma of the European Jew. Should all hope of any type of communal Jewish life in Europe—political, religious or cultural—be abandoned? Should every Jew in Europe leave or lose himself completely in his surroundings? Or were there still possibilities of rebuilding the Jewish communities of Europe? These were perhaps questions that events outside Jewish control would answer. In any case they were the central questions facing the Jews. (See "The Spiritual Reconstruction of European Jewry" by Salo Baron, page 6.)

The Soviet Sphere

The Soviet Union now controlled the fate of most of Europe's Jews. Within its own borders there were two and one-half to three million Jews, including refugees. In addition, about 750,000 Jews lived in the nations within the Soviet sphere of influence—Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet-occupied sections of Germany and Austria.

During the summer of 1945, the attitude of the Kremlin could only be judged from fragments. Within the Soviet Union, Zionism was still outlawed. Apparently there was to be no change in this policy since it was promptly applied in Carpatho-Ukraine, the section of Czechoslovakia acquired by the Soviet Union. No emigration permits were available anywhere in Russia. In July the Moscow radio provoked a controversy about the "mistreatment" of some Soviet nationals in Palestine.

On the other hand, the Communist parties in Britain and the U. S., Jewish Communist delegates from Soviet-dominated nations attending a conference of the World Jewish Congress, and Jewish Communist peripheral organizations supported the building of a "homeland"—though not a "state"—in Palestine. And the Central Committee of the Soviet Trade Unions in Moscow sent a message to Histadruth (Palestine Labor Federation) on July 12. The message was only a polite declination of Histadruth's invitation to send a delegation to Palestine, but it was the first time the Soviet unions had made direct contact with Jewish

Palestine and therefore a sign of the times.

The most tantalizing fragment was a press dispatch from Tel Aviv reporting a speech by M. Kleinbaum, leader of the Polish Jews in Palestine, in which he revealed that Dr. Emil Sommerstein, leader of the Polish Jews in Poland, had asked Joseph Stalin during a reception in the Kremlin whether he would be interested in an international solution of the Jewish problem and Stalin had replied, "Certainly and seriously!" and given him permission to make this reply public. At least three international organizations would be available to Stalin: the World Zionist Organization, the United Nations Organization and a reconstituted Comintern.

Outside the Soviet Union, but within the Soviet power sphere, the fragments made a definite pattern. For nearly all Jews in Central and Eastern Europe the perspective on paper was: restoration of civil rights, elimination of their status as political minorities, assimilation into the nation, or—with reluctant approval—emigration to Palestine.

Bulgaria

Premier Kimon Gheorghieff, in a formal statement on July 5, said: "In principle we have nothing against the aspirations of the Jewish people to ensure themselves a free national home.... We do have certain reservations regarding the emigration of Jews who are Bulgarian citizens, such as the young and able-bodied. These reservations are imposed by considerations of general state policy."

Rumania

Alone among the countries of Europe, Rumania provided citizenship for stateless persons. By a decree issued August 8, persons who had not declared themselves of any nationality since 1930 and whose documents showed that they were stateless were automatically to be considered Rumanians.

The decree contained other far-reaching provisions: It imposed penalties for enquiring into the ethnic origin of any citizen and for incitement to racial hatred. It forbade use of the term "ethnic origin" in public documents, and guaranteed the right to profess freely creed and mother tongue.

In spite of this boon, the Rumanian Jewish community was going through a bitter

struggle between the old Union of Rumanian Jews, led by Dr. William Filderman, and the new Jewish Democratic Committee, a group formed to support the aims of the Soviet-dominated cabinet and to protect the Jews from "diversionist" efforts. The first meeting of the Jewish Democratic Committee was attended by representatives of the Jewish Labor Party, the Hashomer Hatzair, and the Jewish Communist Party. The Jewish Social Democratic Party was not represented.

After the victory of the British Labor Party, Titel Petrescu, president of the Rumanian Social Democratic Party, appealed to the new British government to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. "At the same time," he added, "we recognize the right of the Jews remaining in Rumania to choose their nationality and consider themselves a national minority."

Hungary

Because the Nazis did not reach Hungary until March 1944, the process of extermination was incomplete. Budapest, with 120,000 Jews, was probably the largest Jewish city in Europe.

Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia, a nation concocted of the minorities in the heart of Europe, was through with minorities. It did not want its Germans; it wanted its Magyars to go to Hungary and be Hungarians. Russia had already taken the Ruthenes; Slovakia had become virtually independent from Bohemia-Moravia. And the Jews were invited to go to Palestine or become Czechoslovaks.

President Eduard Benes, in a statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on August 10, said:

"I have always been a friend of Zionism. The establishment of a Jewish Home in Palestine is a necessity for all nations because anti-Semitism is a regrettable but practically inevitable social phenomenon. It will not vanish till the creation of a Jewish country granting citizenship to all Jewry. It would be difficult to repatriate all Jews there, but it could be done soon at least for the European Jews. Those who do not leave for Palestine ought to be assimilated completely to the people of the country they want to live in,

or live there as citizens of a foreign state."

The members of minorities, Dr. Benes explained in a subsequent interview, should be treated as they are in the United States.

Meantime, the anti-Semites in Czechoslovakia found the confusion of nationalities to their liking. In Prague, German Jewish refugees were denounced as Germans. In Kosice, anti-Hungarian demonstrations were combined with anti-Semitic demonstrations. Slovakia was perhaps the worst spot in Europe for the Jews, outside of Poland. Practically nothing had been done toward the restoration of property. Returning Jews were completely destitute in a hostile atmosphere. Early in August, five Jews were killed in what appeared to be a pogrom in Presov.

Dr. Benes frankly recognized and suggested the reason for anti-Semitism in Slovakia. "The chief reason for it," he said on Sept. 3, "is that over a long period Jews have been identified with the Hungarian and German exploiting classes and have not assimilated with the Slovak population."

Greece

The Vice Minister of Finance promised a representative of the Joint Distribution Committee on August 26 that persons who failed to return stolen Jewish property would be prosecuted. The JDC estimated that there were only 8,500 of Greece's pre-war 85,000 Jews left to receive their property. The government announced that property left by murdered Jews for which no heirs were found would go into a special fund for the relief of the Greek Jewish community.

Poland

By midsummer of 1945, almost 150 Jews had been massacred in *Nazirein* Poland. Jews who had survived the Oswiecim and Dachau concentration camps and returned to their homes in Lodz preferred to go back again to Germany and live in American military camps.

The newly recognized Polish government blamed the widespread anti-Semitic violence on supporters of the discarded Polish government-in-exile. But some observers felt that the Warsaw authorities were capable of more vigorous action. They pointed out that only in this respect had the Warsaw regime

failed to maintain order and that this failure, if not due to an inability to control the country, must be due to lack of enthusiasm for corrective measures.

Since simple survival was still the most urgent problem in Poland, the restitution of less elementary rights was secondary. Little had been done toward restoring property.

Apparently Zionism was being allowed a free hand. Dr. Emil Sommerstein, president of the Central Provisional Committee of Polish Jews, was permitted to attend the World Zionist Conference in London. He and the other delegates participated actively. Before returning to Poland they issued a manifesto calling for Zionist unity in behalf of a Jewish state, and recognizing Histadruth as the sole Zionist labor organization in Palestine.

Germany

From the standpoint of physical survival, the Jews of Germany seemed to have fared better than those in any of the Nazi-occupied countries. An official report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, made public on July 23, estimated that two-thirds of the 650,000 full Jews in pre-Hitler Germany escaped extermination. From Hitler's accession to power in 1933 until 1941, German Jews poured out of the Reich into the United States, Palestine, Latin America, the British Dominions and Western Europe. When Jewish emigration was halted in 1941, between 150,000 and 200,000 Jews were trapped in Germany. About ten per cent of them survived.

By a compounding of irony, Germany's part-Jews did worse than the full Jews. Too many part-Jews delayed escape until it was too late. The report estimated that only half of them survived.

For the Jews who wanted to live in the geographical area once known as Germany, the conquering powers provided verbal guarantees. They decreed at Potsdam that: "All Nazi laws which provided the basis of the Hitler regime or established discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, or political opinion shall be abolished." The judicial system, they decided, "will be reorganized in accordance with the principles of democracy, of justice under law, and of equal rights for all citizens without distinction of race, nationality or religion."

Austria

Vienna, with starvation particularly acute and its area cut into four parts administered separately by the four major "Allies," was a center of confusion. Immediately after the Red Army's entry into the city, many Jews, with the assistance of minor officials, had been able to reclaim their old apartments and places of business. But soon a central bureau was established to handle such matters and this authority refused to legalize the transfers, leaving the new-old owners uncertain. The problem was further complicated by the establishment of a class of Nazis—those who joined after 1938 and never held high position—who were being allowed to retain their positions and dwellings.

France

Jews reclaiming their apartments in Paris during May and June had to have police protection. France's few but apparently well-financed native anti-Semitic groups, aided by the anti-Semitic heritage of the Nazis, became a dangerous factor when their activities were linked with the legitimate grievances of returning prisoners of war.

Human Rights

THOUGH the Jews, not having a state, did not have a separate seat at the United Nations Conference on International Organization and though the Conference, called only to set up machinery for an international organization, could not discuss Palestine policy, organized Jewry in all its manifestations was present and extremely active in San Francisco.

An effort to evolve a unified program for American Jewish organizations had been unsuccessful. But two major demands were common to all programs: 1) the promulgation of an international bill of rights, 2) nothing should be done to impair existing Jewish rights in Palestine under the Mandate. Both points were won.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine, supported by the American Jewish Conference, the World Jewish Congress and the Board of Deputies of British Jews, asked for prompt establishment of Palestine as a free

Jewish commonwealth, a matter which UNCIO could not consider.

The fight for formal international recognition and protection of human rights was a particular project of the American Jewish Committee. It had phrased its suggestion as follows:

"To comply with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to 'promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms,' a permanent commission should be set up at the earliest possible time by the United Nations conference to formulate an International Bill of Rights embodying the principles of human rights, fundamental freedoms, religious liberty and racial equality, and a course of procedure for the implementation and enforcement of the Bill."

The substance of this demand got into the United Nations charter only through the alert action of Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, President of the American Jewish Committee and its consultant at UNCIO. The U. S. consultants were informed on the morning of May 2 that they would probably have to be satisfied with the brief Dumbarton Oaks reference to human rights. The consultants were scheduled to see Secretary Stettinius the same afternoon. With the aid of other consultants, Judge Proskauer drew up a petition which he and others presented to the head of the American delegation with such eloquence that Stettinius promised immediate action.

The completed charter contained many references to human rights—in the preamble, the chapters on purposes and the assembly. The chapter on the Economic and Social Council provided that the Council "shall" set up a commission "for the promotion of human rights." The commission is not specifically enjoined to formulate an International Bill of Rights nor does it have any enforcement powers, but Stettinius later stated that the commission "should promptly undertake" to prepare such a bill "which can be accepted by all the member nations as an integral part of their own systems of law." And President Truman, speaking before the final plenary session of UNCIO, said "we have good reason to expect the framing" of such a bill.

Some regarded the incorporation of provisions for human rights in the United Na-

tions Charter as a turning point in history; others regarded it as pious obfuscation.

Whatever became of these provisions, they were something new and positive for a world conference. In the matter of the Palestine Mandate, the Jews at UNCIO were barely able to hold their own against the five Arab states which hoped their newly-organized Arab League would eventually achieve status as a regional agency similar to that given the Inter-American system. Such recognition would have meant liquidation of the Jewish position in the Middle East. Yet this challenge had to be met without weakening the trusteeship system which was intended to be the instrument for the liberation of dependent peoples. It was met by adding the phrase "or any peoples" to an article protecting the existing rights "of any state" under the proposed trusteeship system.

Zionism

For two weeks at the beginning of August, the first World Zionist Conference since the outbreak of war met in London. Among the 85 delegates were Jews from liberated Europe whose stories aroused the Conference to heights of passionate determination. Delegates lashed out against a world that smiled at them but denied them their heart's desire.

But the deeper the passionate determination, the deeper seemed to be the realization that Zionism was still helplessly trapped in the whirlpool of world politics—in spite of British Labor's overwhelming victory. The Labor landslide put the Palestine Mandate in the hands of the most friendly of all possible governments. Yet Clement Attlee's Labor cabinet was also trapped—though not helplessly—in the compulsions of Empire. The Labor Party's devotion-by-resolution to the Jewish homeland, Zionists realized, would always be secondary to the Labor government's inherited imperial commitments.

Like all persons caught in major frustrations, the Zionists denounced each other with unwonted vigor. The fault was not so much the world situation, the militants held, as it was the timidity of Zionist leaders. The World Zionist Executive and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization, were de-

nounced for their patience with Britain. Most outspoken of the militants was David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, who urged passive and active resistance to the White Paper. Britain, he said, would be able to maintain the White Paper's restrictions "only through a regime of bloody terror."

All varieties of Zionists asserted themselves. The religious Zionists who urged intensification of religious education were answered by Labor Zionists who insisted that only Socialism would secure the Jewish Commonwealth. "Refugeeism" was denounced and defended. Intensive cultivation of friendship with the Arabs was urgently set forth as the answer.

In the end, all the conference could do was to reassert old demands. It endorsed the demand of the Jewish Agency for an immediate decision on the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state.

"No solution, except constituting Palestine as an undivided and undiminished Jewish State in accordance with the original purpose of the Balfour Declaration, and no delay or half-measures, can meet the tragedy and the increased sufferings of the Jews," the Conference declared. Europe's surviving Jews "cannot remain in graveyards." Their "only salvation lies in a speedy settlement in Palestine."

The Conference approved a resolution of the Zionist Smaller Actions Committee which set forth certain guarantees in a Jewish state: full equality for all inhabitants regardless of race or religion, cooperation with the Arabs of Palestine for the maximum development of the country in the interests of all, and an alliance of friendship with Arabs of neighboring countries.

The Conference adjourned after adopting four immediate demands:

1. The Jewish Agency for Palestine be vested with authority to bring into Palestine as many Jews as possible and to develop the resources of the country to the maximum.

2. The granting of an international loan to the Jewish Agency for the transfer of the first 1,000,000 Jews from Europe to Palestine.

3. Reparations in kind be exacted from Germany for Jews for the rebuilding of Palestine; all German real estate in Palestine

to be used for the settlement of European Jews.

4. International facilities for the exit and transport of all Jews in European countries who may wish to emigrate to Palestine.

The Mandatory Power

"We have commitments in Southeast Europe, in the Mediterranean and in the Middle East." On September 3, Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee offered this as one reason why British demobilization would be very slow. It was also as close as the new government came to indicating its attitude on Zionism.

The Palestine Mandate incorporating the Balfour Declaration was one of Britain's commitments in the Middle East. But—even for a Labor government—so were the short route to India and the British investment in Middle East oil. These commitments made it certain that no British government would overlook the phrases in the Balfour Declaration guaranteeing protection of Arab rights.

Prime Minister Attlee, under specific questioning in Commons on August 21, would make no statement on Palestine. His appointment of George Henry Hall as Colonial Secretary denoted nothing. Like most other Laborites, Mr. Hall was "pro-Zionist" and had voted against the 1939 White Paper. But that much could also have been said of Winston Churchill.

Meantime, British opinion, conservative and liberal, seemed to be swinging toward the partition of Palestine into independent Jewish and Arab states, a solution first proposed by the Peel Commission in 1937 and later abandoned by the British government as "impracticable."

The liberal and influential *Manchester Guardian*, on the eve of the meeting of the World Zionist Conference urged partition. Two weeks later *The Times* of London declared for partition. *The Spectator*, a liberal weekly, did not commit itself to any specific solution, but opposed an undivided Jewish state. Sir John Chancellor, High Commissioner for Palestine during the riots of 1929, insisted in a letter to *The Times* that the Peel Commission's partition plan was the only practical course.

Meantime, the *Economist*, an influential

independent weekly, plumped for Dr. Judah L. Magnes' bi-national state. The London *Herald*, spokesman of the Labor Party, was silent.

Truman's Views

President Harry S. Truman, in a press conference on August 16, discussed Palestine briefly. In accordance with custom, the President's remarks could not be quoted directly. COMMENTARY has received from Charles G. Ross, Secretary to the President, a summary of Truman's remarks which constituted in effect an official version:

"The President was asked whether anything about the Jewish National State was taken up at Potsdam, and he said that he had discussed the matter with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee and that they were still discussing it. He said he did not discuss it with Generalissimo Stalin as there was nothing Stalin could do about it. In response to another question as to the American view on Palestine, the President said we want to let as many Jews into Palestine as possible. He said the matter would have to be worked out diplomatically with the British and the Arabs so that if a state can be set up it may be set up on a peaceful basis. He added that he had no desire to send 500,000 American soldiers there to make peace in Palestine. There was nothing further on this question at the press conference."

Truman's view brought heated denunciation from Arab spokesmen. "The Arabs have the complete right to object to President Truman's statement," declared Abdul Rahman Azzam Bey, secretary general of the Arab League. "They will never give up their opposition to Jewish immigration to Palestine." President Roosevelt, he claimed, had promised King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia that he would not support the Jews in Palestine.

The Jewish Agency, in an official statement, was circumspect:

"Jews everywhere appreciate the recognition by the American government of the justice of the Jewish desire to bring to Palestine as many Jews as possible and reestablish a national state.

"The Agency must point out that the Palestine issue primarily concerns the Jewish people, the Arabs of Palestine and the great

powers. Arabs of states neighboring Palestine have no other status in Palestine than all other members of the United Nations.

"The question of Palestine is one of the many international problems whose solution must be conceived in justice and equity, and carried out with determination. The notion that large military forces would specially be required in case of Palestine, has, in the conviction of the Jewish Agency, no relation to the realities of the situation."

To the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism, the President's position was "the most realistic statement to have issued from the White House and the most damaging to Zionist objectives." Other observers saw it as, in effect, a reaffirmation of the White Paper with advance notice to the Arabs that any objections they might have to Jewish immigration would receive U. S. support.

Testimonials

Arthur Koestler, author of *Darkness at Noon* and *The Yogi and the Commissar*, revisited Palestine during the summer and departed highly enthusiastic about the Kibbutzim, the agricultural collectives. But he found that life had "degenerated" in Palestine's cities. "It has produced its slums and millionaires, its bureaucracy, café life and jazz." Without the Kibbutz, he said, life in Palestine "would be a great lie."

Leon Blum, former Socialist premier of France, cabled American Labor Zionists: "Today, as before, I stand four-square with the aims and aspirations of the Jewish labor movement in its struggle for the preservation of freedom and in opposition to all limitations upon the continuation of its noble work for the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine based upon justice and cooperation with the working classes of the Arab people and in close collaboration with the international labor movement."

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President of Hebrew Union College, once a strong anti-Zionist, told an interviewer for the *Jewish Post* of Indianapolis that he was now a non-Zionist with "a sympathetic understanding and appreciation of Zionism." However, he was critical of American Zionists. "I am intensely opposed to centering everything in American Jewish life on nationalism."

The United States

IN THE face of the events in Europe, the life of the Jews of the United States seemed relatively undisturbed. But by virtue of these events, a new role was being pressed on the American Jewish community. It now was the largest, the freest and the most influential group of Jews in the world. Jews in Europe and Asia turned to American Jews for every type of material assistance and also—for the first time—for spiritual guidance.

The European catastrophe seemed to have the effect of drawing Jews in America more closely together. This evinced itself in the growth of religious and educational activities

and the intensification of philanthropic work.

The major American philanthropic undertaking for Jews abroad—the United Jewish Appeal—was reconstituted in June after its two major constituent groups, the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal, had disagreed on the allotment of funds and terminated their cooperation at the end of 1944. Under a new two-year agreement, fifty-seven per cent of the funds collected will be allotted to the JDC and forty-three per cent to the UPA, after the United Jewish Appeal's third constituent organization, the National Refugee Service, received its fixed allotment.

SIDNEY HERTZBERG

A CIVILIZATION WITHIN A CIVILIZATION?

An Appraisal of the Philosophy of Reconstructionism

MORDECAI GROSSMAN

CAN Jewish life in this country attain that vitality of function, that variety of content, that integrity and distinctiveness of pattern, and that degree of organization which would endow it with the character of a civilization? In the light of the opportunities and requirements of a democratic design for living, is it desirable that Jews mobilize and direct their energies to the end of creating a Jewish civilization?

Obviously, the answer to these questions depends on what is meant by the term "Jewish civilization." "Civilization," even if not qualified by the adjective "Jewish," has different meanings for different people. There is the conception of an inclusive human civilization, and then there is the conception of tribal or national civilizations, in which sense alone a Jewish civilization is conceivable.

Those who argue the possibility and de-

BEGINNING a series of articles devoted to exploring the basic intellectual currents in Jewish life, COMMENTARY presents here a study of the meaning and implications of Reconstructionism, one of the most thoughtful and influential religious movements in Jewish life today. MORDECAI GROSSMAN is a well-known educator, writer and student of Jewish life. Born in Russia in 1898, he has been educated here and abroad, receiving his Ph.D. from Columbia in philosophy. He has taught at Hebrew Teachers College in Jerusalem, at the College of the City of New York and at the Rand School of Social Science. He is the former editor of *Social Frontier*, and has written extensively for magazines of professional and general interest. At present, he is working on a historical and sociological introduction to contemporary Jewish life in America. In our December issue we will publish a reply to Dr. Grossman's article by the leader of the Reconstructionist movement in America, Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan.

sirability of a Jewish civilization have their common ground in the conception of humanity and human culture as stratified along national lines. They differ, however, on a number of specific issues. There are those who would limit a Jewish civilization to Palestine; others envisage it as world-wide, with Palestine as its center; still others refuse to endow Palestine with a special status in their scheme of a Jewish civilization. Then there is the question of the role of religion in the projected pattern, some maintaining that there can be no Jewish civilization divorced from Jewish religion, whereas others are committed to a purely secular conception. There is in addition the language issue: some would make Hebrew the linguistic base; others, Yiddish; others, both.

This article will confine itself to an appraisal of a particular doctrine as to Jewish civilization in America—the doctrine advanced by the Reconstructionist school of thought, of which Dr. Mordecai Kaplan is the founder and principal exponent. To a great degree the strength or weakness of Reconstructionism can be taken as the strength or weakness of other doctrines of Jewish civilization, all of which are based on a nationalistic approach.

The objective of Reconstructionism is a world-wide, Palestine-centered, Hebraic, religious Jewish civilization. Reconstructionists affirm that only as a full-bodied civilization can Judaism have a vital function and, indeed, survive; that American soil can sustain a Jewish civilization; and that Jews can best contribute to the enrichment of their own lives and serve the interests of the American people and of mankind in general by living their historic heritage as a complete civilization.

In the ten years that have elapsed since its inception, Reconstructionism has gained many adherents among educators, rabbis and lay communal workers. It has contributed measurably to the vitality of Jewish life in this country. The Reconstructionist philosophy is the product of honest, courageous, vigorous, sustained and comprehensive thinking. Nevertheless, this writer feels compelled to register his dissent. I do not say that a Jewish civilization is nowhere desirable and nowhere possible. The rise of a Jewish civilization in Palestine is a fact. And conceivably, Jewish civilization may find suitable soil in some of the multi-national states that may return to life in the postwar world. But I deny the possibility and desirability of a Jewish civilization in a nationally unitarian country like the United States.

There is nothing in the American way of life or climate of opinion, ideas and ideals that encourages the prospect of a Jewish civilization. And even if a Jewish civilization were within the realm of possibility in this country, the harmful consequences entailed would far exceed the gains. While I have no blueprint for an alternative plan, I am convinced that only as a cultural variant of an American civilization, and not as a complete and distinct civilization, can Judaism prosper in this country.

THE question of the possibility and desirability of a Jewish civilization has its meaning in the context of the conditions brought about by Jewish emancipation. Judaism as a civilization is one of several programs formulated to the end of adjusting the historic Jewish heritage to participation in the life of the broader national community.

Until the close of the eighteenth century Judaism was everywhere a complete and self-enclosed way of life. Jewish and non-Jewish culture, of course, interacted upon and fructified each other, but Jews and Gentiles did not really share in a common culture. Jews responded to Judaism with every fiber of their beings. Judaism was perfect of its kind, needing nothing external to

complement it. It meant faith in a supreme being who was, in a special sense, the God of the Jews; hope for the return of the ancient glory that was Zion; Hebrew as a literary and religious language; Jewish vernacular languages as means of everyday communication; the Torah as the sole thing worthy of study; the Jewish community as a commonwealth; ritual practices; Jewish ethics; Jewish etiquette. Jews withstood with integrity the trials and vicissitudes of an alien world, secure in the conviction of the righteousness of their own way of life and certain of their destiny as a people and of their own individual salvations.

Admission of Jews into the political, economic, social and cultural communities of several of the nations among which they lived disintegrated the distinctive patterns of Jewish life and caused a split in the minds and souls of individual Jews. The spread of the scientific outlook, the expansion of capitalist economy, and faith in human progress conceived as a continuous and endless process of amelioration undermined faith in other-worldly salvation. Jews forsook the Jewish way of life; Hebrew and the Jewish vernaculars fell into disuse; the Jewish community lost its scope and authority; Jewish ideals and sanctions ceased to motivate conduct; the Jewish literary heritage ceased to be an intellectual and spiritual stimulus. What was left were fragments of Judaism torn from their context—ethical-monotheism, ritual observance, charity—each claiming to be the “essence” of Judaism. American Judaism, English Judaism, Reform Judaism, Orthodox Judaism, Conservative Judaism and Zionism displaced what was once a uniform pattern of life.

In countries where Jews have come to be identified with the inclusive national group Judaism is no longer a life-process or even an important segment of a life-process. It is rather something imposed from without. To some Jews Judaism is a shadow not to be rid of and yet without function, vitality or interest. To others it is a ghost—insubstantial, yet troubling one's conscience and interfering with life.

Judaism has thus come to be a source of inner conflict for many individuals. What is left of it continues to condition Jews, to fashion their loyalties and mold their ideals and attitudes. As a result of this dual conditioning—by the Jewish heritage and by the inclusive national culture—Jews experience simultaneously the pulls of two objects of loyalty: the Jewish people and the nations of which they are members. They want to be like their non-Jewish neighbors and yet remain different, Jewish. No formula has yet been devised to convert this conflict into a unified and harmonious way of life.

Wherever Jews are admitted to national fellowship they are confronted by the problem of what to do with their own historic heritage. It is a problem Jews alone can solve. It requires a clarification of purposes, and thoughtful, honest answers to a number of interrelated questions:

1. Should Jews retain their distinctiveness, and if so, along what lines? As a national minority, as a religious society, as a cultural group, or what?
2. What elements of the historic Jewish heritage should be retained? What role should these play in a complete pattern of life?
3. What controlling considerations should serve as criteria in making choices? What importance is to be given to the survival of the Jews as a people? To the abundant and secure life for individual Jews? To the integration of Jews in the general scheme of life of their countries? To the ideal of democracy?

The tragic fate of the Jews in continental Europe and the rising tide of anti-Semitism over here have temporarily blunted the sharp edge of the problem of what to do with Judaism. But if democracy has a real future, this problem will again become focal, particularly in America, which is now the home of almost one-half of the world's Jews.

And within a generation virtually all American Jews will be native-born, and almost no one will be left with a personal

memory of segregated Jewish life. Dual conditioning has already long been present.

On the one hand, American Jews participate in all aspects of American life and their attitudes and habits are molded by the common American environment. On the other hand, the majority of them are concentrated in a relatively few metropolitan areas where they have built a vast network of religious, fraternal, social, cultural, charitable, foreign-relief, and Palestine-building organizations to foster Jewish solidarity and consciousness.

But we American Jews can face the problems posed by dual conditioning with greater freedom than has been possible elsewhere. In the first place, America's democratic tradition affords Jews a greater variety of choice as regards their place in the life of the American people as a whole. In the second place, the Jewish community in America, lacking a well-established tradition, is in a position to choose on the basis of reasoned experience. In the third place, American Jews, unlike Europe's surviving Jews, are spared the pressing need to rebuild their individual lives. They are free to give their attention to the problem of Jewish living within the framework of inclusive American life.

Theoretically, there are four ways Jews can deal with their historic heritage: 1) they can discard it and cease being Jews; 2) they can isolate themselves from the general community in order to cultivate an exclusive Jewish way of life; 3) they can make peace with the idea that they are Americans *and* Jews and proceed to live a complete American and a complete Jewish life on two separate planes; 4) they can integrate certain elements of the Jewish cultural heritage in a unitary design for American living.

One does not resolve a dilemma of this kind by clinging steadfastly to one of its horns and ignoring the other. Assimilationists ignore the fact of Jewish conditioning and the further fact that the walls that separate the Jews from other elements of the community are not entirely of Jewish construction. Conceivably, in the process of time Jews will cease to exist as a distinct

people. But if this event transpires, it will be the result of the free interplay and slow merging of cultures and not of a conscious program looking toward assimilation. There is evidence to support the presumption that widespread effort by Jews to assimilate defeats itself by awakening resistances. On the other hand, the Jewish isolationist ignores the fact of conditioning by the general culture. It is extremely unlikely that more than a corporal's guard could be induced to forsake the life of the general community in order the better to cultivate the Jewish way of life.

Thus, only two alternatives are left that merit serious consideration. One is to build a complete Jewish civilization alongside the American one and to fashion a Jewish mentality that is consciously hyphenated and dualistic. This is the program of the Reconstructionists. The other is to integrate certain elements of the historic Jewish heritage as a cultural variant in the more inclusive American way of life.

IN PRESENTING the position of Reconstructionism a distinction should be made between its general philosophy and its specific program for America. (This statement of the Reconstructionists' position is based on *Judaism as a Civilization* by Mordecai M. Kaplan; Macmillan Company, 1935. All quotations are from this book.) This writer objects not so much to the program of Reconstructionism as to its philosophy. By placing special emphasis on the philosophy, the writer does not set up a straw man to knock down. Reconstructionists insist on having their philosophy taken seriously.

The philosophy of Reconstructionism is nationalism—refined nationalism, to be sure, cultural nationalism, the nationalism of civilization—but nationalism all the same. The program calls for the revitalization of the Jewish cultural heritage. One can subscribe to a good deal of this program and at the same time reject its philosophy, which asks for commitments above and beyond the program.

Basic to the philosophy of Reconstruction-

ism are the twin concepts of *nation* and *civilization*. A nation is defined as a group of people who share in a common civilization. A civilization is the residual product of a nation's past life by which it continues its existence as a distinct entity. For Reconstructionists mankind is the arithmetical summation of the nations inhabiting the earth, not an embracing unity that transcends national demarcations. By the same token civilization means the sum total of national civilization, not something shared by all humanity.

The Reconstructionist definition of nationalism is based, not on the way nations actually function, but on the way it is wished they should function. Reconstructionists assure us that the nation is not a state essentially but a cultural fellowship. Exclusiveness of spirit, imperialism and war are written off as perversions of nationalism. In its essence, we are assured, nationalism is a humanizing, civilizing force. To be human in the largest possible sense is to participate in the life of the most inclusive human group, which is the nation. To be civilized in the broadest sense is to have roots in a national civilization.

Reconstructionists deny the reality of civilization and affirm only the reality of civilizations. Just as humanity is divided into nations, so civilization is divided into civilizations, one for each nation. Each is organic, self-enclosed and self-sustaining. A particular civilization can survive even if all others disappear. The distinctive quality of a particular civilization lies not in whatever unique idea or ideal it may have that possesses universal value, but precisely in those elements that cannot be understood by outsiders but which can be "intuited"—and only "intuited"—by the "in" group. Civilizations are their own ends and not the means of a universal mission or function. The "otherness" of a particular civilization and of the national type it fashions need not have any meaning outside its own national group.

The civilization of a nation consists of all material things, ideas, ideals and arrangements it employs to control nature, fashion

the character and mentality of its individual members and order their social relations. It is the intellectual, moral, spiritual and institutional atmosphere in which and by which the members of the particular national group live—the matrix creating their entire round of life, the repository of the ends and means of the life of the nation and of its individual members. Civilizations differ in content but conform to a uniform pattern. All civilizations include language, knowledge, skills, tools, arts, literature, laws, folkways, religion, social institutions, etc., etc.

Dr. Kaplan distinguishes between such "transferable" elements as "mechanical developments, inventions, and the funded discoveries of science," which different civilizations can share and borrow from one another without loss of their respective identities, and "non-transferable" elements such as language, literature, art, religion, folkways and the institutions that give a particular civilization its qualities of "otherness and individuality." While there can be no distinctively Jewish technology and science, there can and ought to be, Reconstructionists tell us, a distinctively Jewish intellectual, spiritual and moral culture and distinctively Jewish institutional arrangements. Jewish civilization is Jewish language, Jewish religion, Jewish literature, Jewish art, Jewish folkways, Jewish law, the Jewish family and community—not separately but woven into a unitary, organic pattern embracing the total round of life of individual Jews.

The Reconstructionist concept of "civilization" closely parallels the anthropologists' "culture." The difference is a matter of terminology. To anthropologists *culture* is the inclusive term denoting the total unique heritage of a group; to Reconstructionists the inclusive term denoting the same entity is *civilization*. In Reconstructionist usage *culture* has a restricted meaning, denoting the literary, artistic, intellectual and spiritual aspects of a group's total heritage or civilization. Reconstructionists employ the term "Jewish civilization" to emphasize that Judaism is more than a culture in this restricted sense, that it includes in addition an inherited way

of social life, with a community, social institutions and laws. The uniform pattern to which, according to Reconstructionism, all civilizations conform is the "universal culture pattern" of the anthropologists. The distinction Dr. Kaplan makes between the "transferable" and "non-transferable" elements of civilization corresponds to the anthropologists' distinction between "material" and "non-material" culture.

The most important point, however, is that the qualities of organic wholeness and self-sufficiency Reconstructionists attribute to all civilizations are characteristic only of the culture of primitive tribes cut off from outside contacts. In a world made interdependent by science and technology, there can be no organic, self-sustaining, self-sufficient cultures and civilizations. The growing reality is not civilizations but Civilization. Along with the "transferable" elements, everything else, including social institutions, religious ideas, art motifs and literary patterns, is now transferred from nation to nation. To strive to preserve the integrity of a national civilization in contemporary times is to attempt to perpetuate a transient cultural lag.

It would be an error to conclude from what has just been said that the Reconstructionists advocate exclusive nationalism and hermetically sealed national civilizations. On the contrary, they recognize that nations interact and that this process enriches national civilizations and broadens the intellectual and moral horizons of the individual. Reconstructionists advocate a kind of national idealism sensitive to the needs and rights of all nations. They advocate, moreover, close cultural cooperation between nations. But it is questionable whether these professed aims are compatible with the conception of nations and civilizations as self-enclosed and self-sufficient entities and with the passion for national and civilizational otherness.

WITH the concept of "civilizational" nationalism as a basis, Reconstructionists proceed to assert that the Jews are a

nation and Judaism is a civilization. The *is* and the *are* in this assertion have different meanings in different contexts. Sometimes the reference is to the past: the Jews once were a nation and Judaism once was a civilization—something that is conceded; at other times the reference is to an ideal future: Jews should be a nation and Judaism should again become a civilization—something that is arguable; at still other times, the reference is to the present: Jews now are, in effect, a nation and Judaism is a civilization—something that calls for a factual demonstration which the Reconstructionists do not undertake; and finally, it is not clear at times whether the reference is to the past, future or present.

As a statement of present fact, the Reconstructionist assertion is easily controverted by the actual pattern of conduct and interests of the majority of Jews. Palestinian Jews *do* conform to the pattern of nationhood; the majority of East-European Jews in the pre-war years *did*; but American Jews and British Jews, among others, *do not*. Judaism in America is neither organic nor pervasive, nor is it potent enough in fashioning the individual personalities of Jews to pass muster as a civilization. To say that the Jewish people as a whole constitute a nation and that Jewish life as a whole constitutes a civilization is to confuse the ideal with the real.

Some of the assertions of the Reconstructionists as regards the possibility and desirability of a Jewish civilization stem from this confusion of the present with the past, of the real with the ideal, of the fact with the wish. "A civilization," says Dr. Kaplan, "is not a deliberate creation. It is as spontaneous as any living organism. Once it exists, it can be guided and directed, but its existence must be determined by the imperatives of a national tradition and the will to live as a nation. Civilization arises not out of planned cooperation, but out of the centuries of inevitable living, working, and striving together." If the "will to live as a nation" were prevalent among the majority of American Jews, if there were in this

country the "living organism" of a Jewish civilization, then our problem would be merely to guide and direct that civilization. But as the facts stand, it is precisely the "deliberate creation" of a Jewish civilization that the Reconstructionists advocate.

I quote again from Dr. Kaplan: "As a civilization, Judaism possesses the prerogative of being an end in itself." If there were in fact a self-contained Jewish civilization, it would indeed be an "end in itself." It would be the framework of all the ends toward which Jews could strive. It would literally be the end, the outside limit, of all Jewish ends. But a Jewish civilization that is to be created or restored cannot claim the "prerogative of being an end in itself." As an ideal yet to be realized, Jewish civilization must be justified by criteria other than those supplied by Jewish tradition.

With their major premise only loosely defined and not at all established, Reconstructionists go on to argue the legitimacy and desirability of a bi-national status for Jews. Jews, they say, constitute—or should—constitute an "international nation." The individual Jew should identify himself fully with the nation of the country in which he lives. He should live in and by means of both the Jewish civilization and the civilization of the country he lives in.

Reconstructionists distinguish between citizenship, which means belonging to a state, and nationalism, which means belonging to a cultural fellowship. Whereas dual citizenship opens the way to a clash of loyalties, dual nationality does not. By disavowing any "fighting allegiance" to a central Jewish authority, in Palestine or elsewhere, Jews are free, Reconstructionists feel, to belong simultaneously to the nation of the country in which they live and to the "international" Jewish nation.

To the charge that they advocate cultural and national hyphenism, the Reconstructionists offer a demurrer. They openly admit the truth of the charge, but, they say: "What of it?" They argue that emancipation of the Jews on the condition that they cease being Jews hardly conforms to

justice. True emancipation of Jews would permit them to acquire the citizenship, nationality and culture of the lands they live in and still retain their Jewish nationality and culture.

Nor are the Jews the only ones, Reconstructionists add, to claim the right of bi-nationalism and bi-culturism. The right is also claimed by Christians. For Christianity, like Judaism, is more than a religion. It is, like Judaism, a religious civilization. Ever since the rise of modern nationalism the Christian has had to live in two civilizations, the Christian and the national. Theoretically at least, the Christians identify themselves with the international community of all Christians and at the same time with a particular national community.

By describing Jews as an "international nation," Reconstructionists might mean that the Jews are or should be a non-territorial nation. But they do not mean this, for they assert Palestine to be the home of the Jewish "nation," and they insist on a Palestine-centered Jewish civilization. They might mean that the Jews are or should be a non-political nation. But the Reconstructionists seem to favor the establishment of a Jewish state or commonwealth in Palestine. In view of the hypothetical bi-nationality of Jews, do the Reconstructionists mean that American Jews have two national homes, one where they live and the other where they do not live? How should an American Jew define his relation to the Jewish state or commonwealth in Palestine once it is established? "Fighting allegiance" on the part of non-Palestinian Jews is ruled out by the Reconstructionists. Is the Jewish commonwealth to be, as far as American Jews are concerned, just another foreign state? Or is the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine to be in some sense the commonwealth of *all* Jews no matter where they live? Clarification of these points is necessary.

The analogy between Christianity and Judaism breaks down at a number of important points. Christianity desires to fashion national civilizations the world over in

its own image; Judaism, as Reconstructionists conceive it, requires the setting up of a Jewish national civilization alongside the national civilizations of different countries. To a Christian, loyalty to a universal human society supplements loyalty to his native land; to the Reconstructionists, loyalty to another particular nation supplements the Jew's loyalty to his native land.

THE chief affirmation of Reconstructionism is that Judaism is indivisible as a civilization. There can be no Jewish religion without a Jewish civilization. Nor can Jewish civilization dispense with Jewish religion. Judaism includes the Jewish religion, the Hebrew language, the Jewish community, Jewish laws, Jewish folkways, Jewish literature and art, and the living memory of Palestine. Each of these elements has meaning, function and vitality only in the context of all the others.

Reconstructionists premise the inseparability of the Jewish religion from Jewish civilization on the assumption that there is no religion but only particular religions; that particular religions are functions of specific civilizations, and that the Jewish religion is the national religion of the Jews.

The function of a religion, as Reconstructionists conceive it, is to consecrate the civilization of a particular people, heighten the people's consciousness of the worth and uniqueness of its civilization and convey the spiritual content implicit in it. A religion without a civilization is without function. A civilization without a religion is mere mechanical routine.

Reconstructionists distinguish between universal religions, of which Christianity is an example, and national religions, among which is the Jewish. Christianity assumes a universal Christian way of life or civilization and a universal Christian people. A national religion functions within the framework of the civilization of a particular people. What makes the Jewish religion Jewish is not an idea or ideal of universal significance but faith in the destiny of the Jewish people; the sense of the supreme worth

of the particular Jewish way of life; the sanctification of things, persons and events derived exclusively from the history of the Jewish nation; and the employment of a national ritual. The difference between a Christian and a Jew is that the former has a national and universal religion whereas the latter has two national religions.

WHY should Jews identify themselves with the Jewish nation? Why should they build a distinctive Jewish civilization? To these questions, Reconstructionists have two answers: 1) the Jewish nation and the Jewish civilization are necessary *means* to the end of an abundant and satisfying life for particular persons called Jews; 2) the Jewish nation and the Jewish civilization are *ends in themselves*.

The first answer is predicated on the assumption that Jewish emancipation has largely failed. Despite the formal equality extended to Jews in some countries, Reconstructionists argue, they are nowhere completely at home. They lack the social and psychic security that flows from the feeling of intimately belonging and being at home in society, they lack the sense of life's meaning that comes from feeling the intimate linkage of the individual's momentary experiences and activities with a people's past history and future destiny. Consequently, Reconstructionists argue, Jews need a Jewish nation and a Jewish civilization. They propose the establishment of Jewish communities which would be responsive to all the life-needs of Jews—economic, social and cultural—and would strain every effort to find for Jews a place in the sun.

What they have in mind is the restoration in democratic countries, America included, of the East-European *Kehillah*, which was a commonwealth within a commonwealth. The goal they look forward to is a community with civil laws and civil courts all its own, with an autonomous "general will" sufficiently pervasive and powerful to fashion the conscience of individual Jews and to control their outer con-

duct; a community which "must at least make a serious attempt to accomplish what, under normal conditions, a nation ought to do for its citizens in the spirit of justice and peace." They propose to restore Judaism as a civilization which could provide the individual Jew with a complete way of life. Reconstructionists, to be sure, do not suggest that Jews withdraw from American and world culture. But they do advocate the broadening and deepening of Jewish "otherness." And they do urge Jews to develop a greater degree of social and cultural self-sufficiency.

Reconstructionists show no inclination to consider the possibility that ways might be found toward genuine equality for Jews and toward their complete identification with and at-homeness in the more inclusive national society. But even if they considered this possibility, it is highly doubtful whether their devotion to a Jewish nation and a Jewish civilization could be weakened thereby. Jewish nation and Jewish civilization are for Reconstructionists not only means to the end of an abundant life for individual Jews, but also the framework within whose limits Jews must seek individual salvation. Jews can enrich their lives by means of their nation and civilization. They must, however, in addition live *for* their nation and civilization.

If indeed it were demonstrated that Jews could never hope to be accepted as full-fledged members of an inclusive national fellowship, we should have no other recourse but to develop our communal resources to the level of nationhood and our cultural heritage to that of a distinct civilization. Admittedly, the ideals of Jewish emancipation have as yet been fully realized nowhere. Admittedly, Jewish rights, though embodied in the laws of democratic countries, are not yet fully translated into social customs and into the attitudes of individuals. But to say that Jewish emancipation has failed is to confuse a moment in a still unfolding historical process with the culmination of that process.

THE DECLINE OF THE THEATER

LOUIS KRONENBERGER

ANOTHER season is beginning on Broadway; shows are racing one another to town; playwrights' names, actors' names, producers' names are being flung about as synonyms for beauty and excitement. The present moment is a delightful one for the press agent, for whom the sky is still the limit; the reviewer, however, if he would remain on solid ground, must look back to last season and bury it with what sighs and oratory it seems worthy of. But funerals, after all, offer excellent opportunities to generalize, to edify the living under pretense of extolling the dead. Or, it may be, of not extolling the dead: the evil that men do is repeated after them.

In any relative sense, the season of 1944-45 was a quite pleasant one. There were two, possibly three, superior musical shows—*Carousel*, *On the Town*, *Bloomer Girl*. There were some likeable comedies—*The Late George Apley*, *I Remember Mama*, *Harvey*. There were some more serious plays that had their good points—*The Deep*, *Mrs. Sykes*, *The Glass Menagerie*, *A Bell For Adano*, *Anna Lucasta*. There were, finally, some interesting or instructive failures dotting the season, things like *Common Ground*, *Dark of the Moon*, *Sing Out Sweet Land*.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER, drama critic for *Time* and *PM*, was marked out last year by *Variety* as being "first in toughness" among the critics of that season; he was also noted for being 91.7 per cent correct in his judgments. The high standards Mr. Kronenberger sets for himself and the theater are the outgrowth of his wide knowledge and enthusiasm for literature in general. A poet since the age of 13, he has also been a novelist—*The Grand Manner*, published 1929; an editor—*An Anthology of Light Verse*, *An Eighteenth Century Miscellany*; and a literary historian—*Kings and Desperate Men: Life in 18th Century England*. Mr. Kronenberger was born in Cincinnati, Ohio.

This is a more rewarding record than any for several seasons past, but it is not a very impressive one for all that. It is not one that calls for much analysis or invites much discussion. One admires, for example, the taste and sense of theater that enabled John van Druten to convert the sugar-water sentiment, the idealized and idea-less world of *I Remember Mama* into a rather engaging evening, but there is nothing at any point in that evening to stop and talk about. One was delighted by the zip and high spirits of *On the Town*; but the ultimate comment on *On the Town* is how shockingly seldom Broadway manages to reach that level rather than how noteworthy is the level itself. The virtues of *Anna Lucasta* are substantially those of a bad novel that one can't put down. The honest substance of *The Glass Menagerie* is horribly vitiated by the pointless and pretentious decorations; the best compliment you can pay the play is that, unlike most others in our time, the core is better than the shell. *Carousel*, it is true, marks something of an advance in its field: whatever its faults, it offers a musical that is genuinely touching and that is really integrated. Richard Rodgers is, of course, one of the few really charming talents we have in the theater; and Oscar Hammerstein has at least planted the hope that we may be getting the right kind of librettist.

By and large, however, what was good about the past season was good merely in the way of entertainment; even what was "interesting" mainly seemed so because Broadway itself is not. In its trappings and devices, the theater of the moment is often lively; but very little of it is alive. In its workmanship, it is often skilful enough, but hardly anything in it passes beyond skill into art. And as we have almost no art on

Broadway, so (much more depressingly) we have almost no real seriousness and almost no commerce in ideas.

In a time of crisis, we may partly excuse a lack of art. The issues are too immediate, the writer is too lacking in perspective; it is not only difficult to be poised and objective, in some cases it is conceivably not desirable. At any rate, one tends to make allowances for the present want of artistry on Broadway, even though one knows quite well that it derives from something more than momentary dislocations—from a lack of discipline, of aspiration, of maturity, not to speak of talent. But that a world of crisis should produce so little that is thoughtful or social-minded or intense, so few yearnings, so little yeast—that shocks almost as much as it disappoints us. The past season contributed exactly two plays—three, if you include a ghastly off-Broadway production of Berthold Brecht's four-year-old *Private Life of the Master Race*—that come under the head of social theater; and neither Edward Chodorov's *Common Ground* nor the stage version of *A Bell For Adano* can be said to have very much enriched the medium.

Perhaps the best thing about *Adano* as a novel—its sense of indignation—has disappeared from the play. What remains of any value, at least of any popular value, is a kind of simple faith in democracy, in the spiritual victory Joppolo achieved, regardless of personal defeat. But, beyond the hopelessly elementary treatment of character, the black-and-white portrayal of issues that makes *A Bell For Adano* a work of benevolence rather than of insight, the end of the play is in perfect character with Broadway's general approach to social problems. The loudly pealing bell may offer just the right sort of affirmation; it offers just the wrong sort of reassurance. For it much less incites the audience to emulate Joppolo than it leads it to imagine that by triumphing in *Adano*, democracy has somehow triumphed everywhere. What was at best one man's *modus operandi* is given all the appearance of a universal solution. Broadway somehow must send its audiences home comforted,

even in the case of plays that are meant to disconcert. The result is that most people go out of the theater not with more sense of responsibility than they went in, with less.

One of the good things about Edward Chodorov as a pamphleteering playwright is that—whether in *Decision* or *Common Ground*—he is really disturbed. *Common Ground*—the story of a small USO unit captured by Nazis in Italy and forced to choose between trouping as Axis propagandists and being shot—is of special interest to us for having a Jew as its leading character. To pass him by for a moment, it is also of special interest for having (in the person of an American newspaperman who has become an Axis mouthpiece) a psychopathic Jew-hater as its most upsetting element. When, in the first act, the newspaperman suddenly spits out his sick and shocking venom, every Jew in the audience feels as if he has been given a kick in the belly. Broadway rarely goes in for such body blows, which is why its social theater lags so far behind even the newspapers in its ability to rouse or even to reveal. The theater cannot really hope to correct until it is honestly willing to expose.

In contrast to his vicious anti-Semite, Mr. Chodorov has not portrayed an exemplary Jew. His Jew, a Hollywood actor who has partly joined the USO to further his reputation, has a good deal about him of the show-off and the wisecracker; is, indeed, a type that his more sensitive, or at least more genteel, co-religionists are given to blush over. Moreover, being Jewish, he—unlike the others in the troupe—is not allowed to make a choice, but is immediately condemned to a concentration camp. In his isolated role, he achieves certain realizations, but is mainly converted into an unconsciously self-dramatized figure of gallantry. Such an attitude has much to be said for it psychologically—it has turned up very often in real life, as with the "Guggenheim knows how to die" on the deck of the *Titanic*. But in *Common Ground* it tends to displace tragedy with pathos; and in view of the rest of the play, one suspects that the gallantry

has partly been seized upon for its popular and sentimental appeal. For the play itself, after a rather electrical first act, loses its bearings as both document and drama, to become one more of those death-vs.-dishonor contraptions where the dilemma, though it continues to exist in real life, has been so degraded on the stage that only first-rate talent can redeem it. Unfortunately Mr. Chodorov is not very talented, and as a result his play is not very effective, even as pamphleteering. But as citizen if not as artist, he is a serious man, prepared to impose his own ideas on the stage rather than succumb to its timid compromises.

These compromises operate almost as rigorously outside the social drama as in it; indeed, the only other play of the season that impressed one for any independent-mindedness—a play that most reviewers brutally tossed aside—was George Kelly's *The Deep Mrs. Sykes*. This small drama, concerned with exposure rather than action, simply used the repercussions of a seemingly trivial incident as a way of revealing a half dozen people's tangled relationships and thwarted lives. It employed, as I said when I reviewed it, a pebble-thrown-into-a-pool technique, the ripples slowly widening until the whole pool has been disturbed. The serious, possibly the insuperable, fault of the play was that Mr. Kelly allowed his characters to explain one another rather than expose themselves; the whole thing was more of a pat psychological blueprint than a flesh-and-blood picture. That said, however, the play began to have virtues unique in their season; and not simply the virtues of dialogue and characterization to be expected of the author of *The Show-Off*, *Craig's Wife* and *Behold the Bridegroom*. What impressed you most if only by its rarity was Mr. Kelly's refusal to play safe as a dramatist, his indifference to what will "go" on the stage—a refusal and indifference all the more honorable because Mr. Kelly, who obviously possesses the skill to please others, had the courage to please himself. If he allowed a drunken woman to go on babbling, if he left the stage bare for whole moments, it

was in a conscious defiance of the risks. The result was a play that for all its shortcomings proved generally engrossing and adult. It was also something of a retort upon the cowed, unadventurous, opportunistic methods of the current Broadway stage.

FOR there is no use pretending any longer that the Broadway stage in recent seasons has been a really adventurous or responsible or grown-up medium. It continues, quite often, to give pleasure as entertainment; to provide excitement for its acting or directing; even to offer at times that special vividness and lure that belong to the theater and cannot be exactly duplicated outside it. But there, barring a very rare play, its value stops. The trouble is not simply that Broadway is so "commercial," but that it is so backward and banal in its commercialism. That hankering after culture, that materialistic idealism that is so cardinal a part of American life—that has made classical music or The Modern Library the possession of millions—is not in evidence in the theater. Even Hollywood, however vulgar and flatulent its aspirations, really aspires. But the theater does not aspire.

You will find that the theater is the only one of the arts in America that does nothing to keep its classics in circulation; in contrast to last season's record in music, art, books, opera, ballet, even cinema, exactly one classic—*The Tempest*—was revived on Broadway; and the season before there were exactly two—*Othello* and *The Cherry Orchard*. The need for real and continuous repertory, on a sound production level, is a very great one; the more so, surely, in a disordered era when there is little new drama of value, and some excuse for there not being. As a result, there is more than a lack of substance, there is a lack of standards; with a lack of standards there must pretty plainly come a lack of discipline; from a lack of discipline there comes the squandering, even the butchering of talent.

An Odets or a Saroyan is hardly hailed for his promise before he is attacked for his failure to live up to it. You may, in view

of what is wayward, flamboyant and self-indulgent in both these men, suspect that in any circumstances they would be incapable of sustained achievement. Possibly; but the atmosphere in which they and certain other not untalented playwrights have worked has all the same been a terribly harmful one. These unformed playwrights were actually *setting* the standards instead of struggling to meet existing ones; for there virtually were no existing ones. Aside from Lillian Hellman, Odets and Saroyan are the only striking talents to have emerged on Broadway during the past dozen years, and none of the older practising talents have really exerted an influence.

It is bad enough for gifted young playwrights to run wild when they should be putting themselves to school; what is worse is that, at the most formative period of their careers, they too often gain no more freedom than they do discipline. Hollywood reaches out for them and ties them up to learn its trade, just when, if they ever shall, they should be learning their own. That Hollywood commandeers young writers' time seems to me more destructive than that it possibly corrupts established writers' talent. And so long as such artistic cradle-snatching continues, we have one more reason for not looking forward to a renaissance in the theater.

In men like Odets and Saroyan there is at least some measure of nonconformity. With most other playwrights the capitulation to Broadway standards seems painfully complete. So terribly little gets said, let alone said right. Those of us in the audience who happen to be Jews, liberals, intellectuals—who are strongly concerned with the world around us, but who care too for art—are seldom even forced to decide whether the substance of our topical drama compensates for the lack of form. Even the substance is thinned out and watered down, even the "message" is made consoling or ambiguous or respectable.

Our playwrights, with a few exceptions, pose knotty problems only to offer flabby answers; the theater seems to me most ir-

responsible today not for what it ignores but for what it renders innocuous; not for failing to arouse us but for arousing us only to lull us back to sleep. At least half the plays I see on such subjects as Fascism, anti-Semitism, the war, the peace, strike me as having been written as much because they were "timely" as because they were troubling.

The social drama of the thirties—which failed, but failed with passion—is almost extinct. As for what seems in retrospect like the living drama of the twenties, even its ghost is vanishing. We may overrate that drama today, that body of work created by the Shaws and O'Caseys, the Abbey and the Moscow Art, the Werfels and Pirandellos, and in this country by the Sidney Howards and George Kellys and Elmer Rices and Eugene O'Neills, but this much, at the very least, can be said of it: one was not constantly asking just how good the plays of that era might be, so many of them were interesting.

ALL these comments constitute a harsh indictment, but I don't mean for it to be a glib one. Any critic who approaches the theater as a moralist ought also to approach it as a realist and confess that, however glaring its sins, the theater is a very difficult and in certain respects a very thankless medium. There are not only many things that it cannot do at all—things, for example, that must be left to the novel—but there are equally many things that it seems unable to do with impunity. Almost every serious play, it would sometimes seem, must steer between the Scylla of ineffectiveness (which is apt to be the penalty of simply telling the plain unvarnished truth) and the Charybdis of over-contrivance (which is apt to be the penalty of making the truth dramatic). After all, it is the theater's first obligation to be dramatic—to deal with conflicts and crises and climaxes, to create suspense and contrive situations; and usually the more "interesting" your situation, the harder it becomes to resolve. Again, the more that plot and situation count—and in the highest classical sense as well as the

lowest popular one, they count more than anything else on the stage—the more must character and probability tend to be sacrificed.

Well! so far as all this is true, the playwright is a bedevilled creature and many of his "compromises" are hardly to be labeled crimes. For a long time, indeed, it has seemed to me that our theater is doomed if it persists in going in for realism, the realism in which the playwright's prime object is to impress us by his fidelity to life as we recognize it. Realism in that sense is not only too much lacking in color for the stage; it also demands a degree of background and a sense of passing time that the theater can't provide. In novels people can slowly grow and change, and complicated situations have time to be plausibly worked out. In novels men can repent or "get religion" or come to know themselves or see into others; but on the stage a predicament that seems hopelessly entangled at 10:45 p.m. cannot be convincingly resolved by 10:58. For that reason alone, the realistic theater must always be a welter of highly unsatisfactory third acts.

Not reality but intensity seems to me the great concern, the great contribution of the stage; whether the intensity of *Othello*, that makes the "reality" of it ultimately unimportant; or the intensity of the topical play that brings home with passion the general truth, whether or not it slurs the specific fact. And for that matter, there is an intensity of farce and comedy that Broadway seems never to have heard of; another reason for reviving our classics, an Aristophanes or a Ben Jonson.

But having noted the playwright's difficulties, one still winds up condemning his present faults. Indeed, there is no helping it but to descend to the outright didactic and quote once more, "Not failure but low aim is crime." Broadway today depresses one most of all by the lowness of its aims. Sheer entertainment apart, there aren't eight Americans now writing plays who either in their failures or their successes are really worth our most serious attention. The answer, I think, isn't so much a lack of real talent—though there is not very much real talent—as a want of adulthood, of audacity, of integrity.

In the work of some of our most skilful comedy-writers one gets the feeling that the author kept saying to himself, not "Is this funny?" but "Will this get a laugh?" The point involved becomes ten times more disquieting in the case of so-called serious plays. There you find often quite reputable playwrights with third-act trouble concocting new endings by the carload—happy endings, unhappy endings, semi-happy endings; throwing characters out, at the very last moment, or writing new ones in; destroying half the point of the play for the sake of a curtain line. (And I'm not speaking of technical considerations.) It was all very well for Dr. Johnson to say of actors that "we must live to please who please to live"; he would hardly have agreed that authors should garble to get produced. Their deference to what they think the public likes has debased a good deal of genuine wit and skill; so that the virtues of present-day Broadway seem at times almost more distressing than the faults.

A PRAYER FOR DEW

A Story

PAUL GOODMAN

AND the offering of Judah and Jerusalem shall be a delight unto the Lord, as in days of old, as in ancient years."

With this ending of the great Standing-prayer, the congregation sat down.

It was Passover and a springtime thunder-shower was washing the windows of the synagogue, amid prolonged rumblings of thunder and many flashes of lightning. It was dark and all the electric lights had been turned on—by the Negro janitor (in accordance with the injunction, "On the first day shall be a holy convocation, ye [Jews] shall do no servile work").

Moonfaced Rabbi Horn stood up in front of the closed curtain of the ark, adjusted his substantial sleeves, and said: "We come now to the most beautiful prayer of the day, *Tefilas Tal*, the Prayer for Dew. This prayer is said before the open ark; it comes from the heart of springtime longing. What could man do without the rain? The rain falls in order to fill the rivers, and the rivers flow into the seas and lakes in order to evaporate into clouds. Who will give me fifteen dollars for the honor of opening the ark for *Tal*, for *P'sichas Tal*, the opening of the ark for *Tal*? What am I bid? Do I hear anybody bid fifteen dollars?"

"Four dollars for my son, in memory of

PAUL GOODMAN is the young avant-garde writer whose latest book, *The Facts of Life*, elicited both enthusiastic and puzzled response from the critics. He has written about 20 books in all, including fiction, poetry, drama, criticism and city-planning, among them *The Grand Piano*, a surrealist novel, and *Stop Light*, a book of Japanese *noh* plays. Mr. Goodman holds his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, and has taught at that institution and in progressive schools.

my husband Isaac Podolnik," called down Mrs. Podolnik from the women's gallery.

"Six dollars!" said Mr. Brody with a quiet smile.

The Rabbi and the President, who wore a silk hat, looked up at the widow Podolnik.

"Just what," I turned round to my friend Leo, sitting behind me with his white-shawled father, "what is the *mitzvah* of a bid made in honor of somebody when it doesn't win the auction?" I was at that time a member of the skeptical and mocking fraternity.

"Seven dollars!" called a voice in the rear.

"Seven dollars is bid back here," said the beadle, hastening to the spot.

"What's the name please?" asked the Rabbi tending his large ear, that was like a handle to the moon.

"Thumim."

"Berman! Mr. Berman bids seven dollars."

"Seven-fifty," said Brody quietly.

"Seven-fifty is bid for the opening of the Holy Ark for the springtime prayer for Dew," said Rabbi Horn.

MEANTIME the rain, not prayed for yet, thudded against the windows and on the skylight of green glass. The water could be heard busily flowing down the runnels and the drainpipes—a "pleasant noise of waters." A burst of lightning sharply silhouetted the old men near the window, with their fringes over their heads, and brightly illuminated the fringes.

"Eight-fifty!" said Mr. Thumim.

"Mr. Berman bids eight-fifty," said the Rabbi.

"Eight-seventy-five," said Brody.

"Nine!" cried Thumim excitedly.

"Nine and a half," said Brody.

There was a crack of thunder and one of the electric lights over the reading-table dimmed, and went dark.

"Nunny," said the President to his little son, "go call the *shfartse* to bring a new bulb."

Nunny ran down the aisle, bouncing a rubber ball on the red carpet.

Throughout the synagogue the conversation became general. Everywhere comments about the weather; and far in the rear a burst of laughter where some one had just told a new joke.

My friend Leo, the seminarian, at last gave an opinion on the status of the widow Podolnik's offer that had been outbid. "She fulfilled a commandment in starting the bidding off," he said in my ear. "It is a *mitzvah* to start something off. *Sof ma'aseh mach-shava tehila*: the end of the deed is the thought of the Beginning!—"

As if afire the Jewish joke progressed from bench to bench, greeted at each telling with a greater outburst of hilarity.

"*B'reshith*—in the Beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

"Shh! shh! this is a synagogue!" admonished the President pounding the palm of his hand loudly against his open prayer-book. The buzz fell an octave lower on the scale, as happens on a meadow in the month of August when the sun passes momentarily behind a cloud.

"Twelve dollars!" rang out the voice of Thumim in a last desperate raise.

"Twelve-fifty," said Brody.

"For heaven's sake, Marcus—" said Brody's brother-in-law, tugging wildly at his sleeve.

"So?" Brody turned to him with a bland smile. "Did I say I want the bid? I'm just—raising a little."

"Twelve-fifty is bid by Mr. Meyer Brody for the honor of opening the ark for *Tal*."

"Fifteen dollars!" thundered a new voice on the left.

"Ah," said the Rabbi, "now we're getting somewhere."

"Sixteen," said Brody.

"Seventeen!" boomed the voice.

"Seventeen-seventy-five," said Brody.

PRECEDED by Nunny now bouncing a different ball, a small red ball at the end of an elastic string, Aaron, the grizzled-haired Negro janitor, came down the aisle carrying a ladder and a frosted bulb. He climbed on the ladder stretching up his arm to unscrew the burnt-out light and the ladder began to wobble. The Reader lent his hand to hold it firm.

"The question is," I said to Leo, "whether he should even lend his hand to hold the ladder—"

"The answer is Yes," said Leo sharply. "This comes under the rubric of helping to preserve a man from injury."

"Twenty dollars!" said the booming voice on the left.

"Twenty dollars is bid!" cried Rabbi Horn joyously. "What is the name please?"

"Samuelson—Ely Samuelson."

"Ah, Mr. Samuelson!" exclaimed Rabbi Horn with joyous and flattering quaver that he mostly reserved for weddings. "Mr. Samuelson is not a member of our congregation," he explained to everybody. "He is a visitor from Providence, the capital of Rhode Island. His uncle, however, is our dear President Mr. Sonnenschein; and I am sure that you will all join with me in telling Mr. Samuelson that he is just as much at home in this congregation as in Providence, Rhode Island."

"I'll give just one more hike," said Brody quietly to us. "After such a build-up by the Rabbi, how can he get out of taking the bid? But why should I make him pay more than he can afford?"

"Twenty-three dollars," he called out after judicious consideration.

"Twenty-five!" said Mr. Samuelson, on the left.

"Good—take it," said Brody, and turned round to us triumphantly.

"I bid them up all the way from four dollars to twenty-five!—After all, why shouldn't the money go to the synagogue? Have I been playing auction-pinochle for forty years for nothing? Always you can tell when you can bid them up and when there's nothing doing! Seventeen-seventy-five: there was a bid! Who could refuse to go at least

to eighteen? But in a game of pinochle, never three-forty; always force them into it; then just drop your cards and say Good! take it!

"Sometimes in a game," said Brody, "they think that *they're* boosting *me*; but the fact is that *I'm* boosting *them*."

The pinochle-player of the Lord.

THE Cantor and his choir of black-robed boys had begun to gather at the reading-table under the light that had been repaired (but it now shone dimly in the brightening space). Several of the young soprani were downstairs in the cellar playing punchball, and their piercing cries could be heard in the distance.

At last, after its triumphant progress from the rear of the room across the entire congregation to us in the front, the joke arrived at our bench; but it proved to be the antique story, that I have already set down elsewhere, about the little Jew in the crowded trolley-car who sings "Deedle-deedle-dee, it ain't my setchel."

"Look here, Brody," I said, "supposing the Rabbi decided to knock it down to *both* of you, and have both of you grasp the cord to open the curtain. Ha, then what?"

"It shouldn't happen on *Pesach*," said Brody, turning pale.

The Cantor, who had a white hat with a pom-pom, now stood up on a stool to tower, with his pom-pom, above the boys. For unfortunately, though he was very broad-shouldered and had a powerful black beard and a bass voice, he was only five feet high. Like Ulysses, "when he was seated he looked imposing, but when he rose to his feet you saw that he was of small stature." From the top of a stool he dominated the scene, and often, holding a long note, he would dart a sidewise and upwards glance at the women.

He smote the table with his little tuning-fork and held the sound to his ear, while the vibration welled out amongst us with the unpleasant ring of pure, colorless music. (At one time he had been accustomed to use a pitch-pipe, but this was considered by some

of the orthodox as playing a musical instrument.) The choir, catching the note, sang an A-minor chord. And as if created out of nothing, the tranquillity of nature, the natural harmony, crowded into the corners of the space.

"Will the Congregation please rise," said Rabbi Horn, "for the repetition of the *Amidah* and the singing of *Tefilas Tal*. Mr. Samuelson, will you please come up and stand alongside me on the platform."

BARUKH . . . Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God and God of our fathers—" began the Cantor in a deep voice, accompanied by a humming continuo of the boys.

"God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob; great, strong, and awful God, God most high, who grantest goodly favors and art the owner of all that is. Thou rememberest the piety of our fathers, and Thou wilt bring a redeemer to their children's children, for Thy name's sake, in love. King, Helper, Savior, and Shield: Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Shield of Abraham.

"Strong to eternity, O Lord, who quickenest the dead and art mighty to save."

The numerous and progressing chords of the choir, and the flowing line of the Cantor's voice, now baritone, penetrated every corner and we were (for the most part) still.

While Brody looked on with an ecstatic smile, Mr. Samuelson smartly pulled the cord of the curtain over the ark and disclosed the ranks of a dozen scrolls of the Law, dressed in white silk, wearing silver crowns.

The Congregation of Jews rose.

"Our God and God of our fathers, grant Dew!" said all.

"Grant dew, to quench the thirst of Thy land—" sang the Cantor alone, for all.

"In holy joy, sprinkle on us Thy blessing—with quantity of wine and corn establish the City of Thy desire!"

"B'tal! . . . with Dew!" shouted all, while the choir gave voice to a loud paean.

Now the thunderstorm had moderated to a light steady rain, tapping on the skylight, flowing down all the drains. Meantime the

space had become brighter, and the artificial lights shone dim and pale.

There were many stanzas to the poem, each comparing, in some trope or other, the state of the Jewish people in exile to that of a land thirsting and without water.

"With dew and contentment fill our barns—" sang the Singer of this agricultural

people, accompanied by the continuo of the choir.

*"Renew our days as of old—
Beloved, according to Thy valuation uplift
our name—*

make us like a garden well-watered—"

"B'tal!" shouted all.

"... with Dew!"

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY FINDS ITS POET

HERTHA PAULI

I AM not able to write to order," Miss Lazarus wrote to the ex-Secretary of State. He had requested a poetic contribution to the Statue of Liberty Pedestal Fund; the date was 1883, and the famous statue stood in a Parisian suburb, a baseless, soulless, forsaken-looking colossus finished by France and waiting for America to set up its promised foundation in New York harbor. But the response here was weak, to say the least.

The last hope rested on a sale of manuscripts by literary celebrities, dead or alive, including Longfellow, Bryant, Whitman and Mark Twain—and upon the 34-year-old Miss Lazarus, whose fame, long privately budding, had just soared at an odd tangent and who regretted that she could not "write to order."

It was her usual way of refusal. A few years earlier she gave the same answer to her old religious teacher, Rabbi Gottheil, who wanted a poem for his Jewish hymn book. Then she had added: "I will gladly assist you as far as I am able; but that will not be much. I shall always be loyal to my race, but I feel no religious fervor in my soul."

Miss Lazarus came from an old Sephardic family but her young soul shrank

HERTHA PAULI has shared the experiences of the "homeless" and "tempest-tost" masses whom Emma Lazarus addressed in her famous poem. The writer comes from a distinguished Viennese family. She left Berlin, where she had been acting under Reinhardt, on Hitler's assumption of power; fled her native Austria for Paris on the day of the Anschluss; after the French debacle escaped on foot over the Pyrenees, finally reaching this country on a rescue list of anti-Nazi writers. Since giving up her stage career in 1933, she has produced many novels and biographies. At present Miss Pauli is engaged on a larger work on the Statue of Liberty, of which the present essay will form a part.

from the Jewish life. The sugar merchant Moses Lazarus and his wife Esther, *née* Nathan, kept an orthodox house; at the Passover table six daughters heard their brother Frank traditionally read the ancient text, "Let then each consider as though he himself had been delivered from Egypt," but little Emma listened without understanding. Nor could she relate her pride in her race to her more recent ancestors' decision to give up their country rather than their faith. To the American child, 1492 implied Columbus' voyage, not the expulsion of the Jews from Spain.

She grew up well protected. The family lived on Fourteenth Street, near Union Square—but Union Square, in those days, was a stamping ground for blooded carriage horses, not polyg' advocates of self-help by the underprivileged. The children of Mr. Lazarus were privately tutored. Emma met few strangers, knew few people other than her own. She was precocious, shy, unusually serious and fond of solitude, and from these traits her father deduced special gifts: at seven, when her sisters laughed at her first childish verse, he warned her not to mind them but to keep on working. More and more, her bright, inquisitive mind turned inward and to that most introspective of arts, lyric poetry. At fourteen she had written a whole book of stilted rhymes, full of shattered hearts and broken vows; the chief characters were Apollo, Daphne and Aphrodite; the chief topics—strange for a carefree adolescent—were Age and Death. The chief merit of her achievement was quantity; sister Josephine, her best-loved playmate, proudly told of Emma's penning 1500 lines in two weeks. And yet, in these awkward lines one could first sense the relentless sincerity, the near-possessedness which would mark her work although it could not satisfy her yearnings.

At sixteen she saw her first book, *Poems and Translations*, printed "for private circulation." It was well received; William Cullen Bryant, the master of the succinct superlative, called the poems better than any he recalled "by any American girl of eighteen." At the time of Whitman's hounding by literary America, Emma succeeded by sticking to the rules. Her translations of poems by Heine revealed skill and sympathy, a creditable knowledge of German and a lack of all feeling for the provocative iridescence of that most cosmopolitan of poetic spirits. Miss Lazarus, to whom the gay side of art would always remain foreign, saw Heine purely as a German romantic, failing to see either the "wittiest Frenchman since Voltaire" or the unwilling Jew. (Of course Heine, the apostate, was then still suspect to conscious Jews everywhere, but Emma, without a thought of apostasy, had effaced her Jewish consciousness far more completely than the sentimentalist who wrote *The Rabbi of Bacharach* in the year of his baptism.)

Miss Lazarus set her course by different stars. Old World thought had just found an American expression in Transcendentalism, a sort of cosmic individualism with a Concord accent. Concord, linked to Harvard College and Back Bay by an intellectual party line, was the Weimar of the new American civilization, the Mecca of American youth. Its spirit was the only one of which the young New York Jewess would be a part.

SHE first read Ralph Waldo Emerson in her teens. The impression of his poetry is doubtful (she sharply criticized it later) but his ideas became her "bread and wine." The faith he preached, of the individual in himself and in the equal divinity of all men, became her religion. "Every man," said Emerson, "has his magnetic needle," to be found by "trusting himself, by listening to the whisper of the voice within him"—it was that voice to which Emma had long listened passionately, fearful almost of listening to another. Now she joined a mass movement. She asked, "To how many youth-

ful hearts has not his word been the beacon—nay more, the guiding star—that led them safely through periods of mental storm and struggle?" At last presented to the aging oracle at the house of his friend Samuel Ward Gray, she thrilled to the "tall, spare figure crowned by the small head carrying out with its birdlike delicacy and poise the aquiline effect of the beaked nose and piercing eyes. Unforgettable eagle eyes, full of smiling wisdom!"

The success of her book encouraged her to send a copy to Concord, shyly referring to the meeting at Mr. Gray's. Emerson, whose memory by then failed to retain much more important matters, had long forgotten both the occasion and the awkward girl with the somewhat sharp profile. As to ignore her entirely would have been unkind, she got a few lines of benevolent approbation. Emma replied post-haste; it was the beginning of a long correspondence.

She was "astonished and delighted by the high estimate" placed on her poetry. The master found her sympathies "too classical"? She had other samples. She naively consulted him about James R. Lowell's remark that she should be "sent back to learn her lesson over again"—was she not capable of anything worthwhile? The reply: "Mr. Lowell is right if by rough judgment he can drive you to a severer pruning of your verses. . . . After recording Shakespeare for fifteen minutes you shall read this manuscript a page or two and see what you can spare. . . ."

He found her ode on Thoreau "not worth any day-dawn or midnight oil"—she threw it away. Before he spoke, she had no opinion on anything. Emerson may have been flattered. Though slow at times, his replies never failed to arrive. Once he wrote, "I know too well the value of having a sensible soul to speak to and hear from." At another time he called "transparent sincerity" her greatest attraction. Yet her *Admetus* drew a warm, "All hail! You have written a noble poem which I cannot enough praise," and for the first time the signature: "Ever your friend."

Her second book, *Admetus and Other Poems*, was dedicated "to my friend Ralph Waldo Emerson."

He was the master, she was the disciple; spiritually Emma sat at Emerson's feet, but besides, the relationship seemed to recall attractive literary prototypes. Her next work, *Alide*, a novel, dealt with the old problem of the great poet and the maiden—ostensibly, Goethe and Friederike Brion. Of course she carefully kept these unauthorized flights of her fancy from the sage of Concord.

For ten years their imaginary friendship dominated Emma's life. An Emersonian phrase became her slogan: "The epochs of our life are not in the visible facts, but in the silent thoughts by the wayside." She wrote, but not to express feeling, or present conflicts of life—she wrote in lieu of living. Not just her thoughts, her very life remained silent and by the wayside. She shunned reality; it was both her charm and her weakness.

Disenchantment was inevitable; that at first it took a childish form might have been expected. In his American anthology, *Parvassus*, Emerson omitted Emma, and Emma fell out of the clouds. She wrote to him, about her "extreme disappointment," and for the first time her idol did not reply. By then—it was 1874—she had found both American and English recognition; from Paris Turgenev wrote of finding *Alide* "very sincere and poetical"; John Burroughs wrote that her work had drawn Whitman's attention, adding, "I hope you are not judging yourself so harshly as you were. . . . Cherish, encourage, insist upon yourself!" No praise could make up for Emerson's disapproval. Emma blamed only herself and grew despondent; she had "accomplished nothing to stir, to awaken, to teach or suggest, nothing the world could not equally do without. . . ."

A more real blow fell in the same year. Her mother died. A circle was torn, her only link with reality and at the same time her shield against it. Emma clung to her father; he was to remain the only true love of her life. About this time Edmund Sted-

man, the "poet-banker" of New York, suggested the Jewish tradition as her human and artistic heritage, but Emma shook her head. She was "proud of her blood and lineage," but "the Hebrew ideals did not appeal" to her.

In the spring of 1876, as if the great disappointment could still be mended, Emerson sent a letter. "You," he wrote, "who, I believe, have never entered Massachusetts, should come and spend a week in Concord and correct our village narrowness. My wife joins me," etc.

"I have waited ten years for this moment," cried the 27-year-old who had never traveled without her family, who had seen nothing of the world except New York and their summer home in New Haven, and now should see the Grail's castle of her youth.

Emma's heart pounded as she got off the train; there was the "tall, spare figure"—Mr. Emerson was at the depot to meet her. Her timidity welled up but "the first glance at his benevolent face sufficed to set the shyest at their ease."

Miss Lazarus spent her week in this "modest home looking upon orchard and garden, in the midst of wholesome, natural influences." Concord was "lovely, smiling with its quiet meadows, quiet slopes, quietest rivers," but its rural calm would not let Emma forget the identity of her host—of him whose "soul was like a star and dwelt apart." She was not a city girl in the country. She was an aspiring poetess at civilization's cradle.

She met the Concord circle, disliked Bronson Alcott, found William Ellery Channing's figure standing out "like a gnarled and twisted shrub—a pathetic, impossible creature"; with all of them she found an inexhaustible topic of conversation in the late Henry Thoreau. Emerson took her to Walden Pond, where Thoreau had retired to prove that man was not of necessity a gregarious animal; she saw the rock-pile marking the site of the hut in which Thoreau had lived; she gazed into a misty distance, at the roof of his birthplace. At the

farewell, when her week was up, Channing gave her a package. She did not open it until later, to find a copy of Channing's book on Thoreau, and the very compass which the nature-lover had carried on his expedition into the Maine woods.

Emma treasured the keepsake. Somehow the dead Thoreau seemed to be a more fitting link to Concord and its circle than the surviving members. As the train rolled south, the whole world of Transcendentalism seemed to stay behind, hovering about the small New England town and passing with it beyond a poetic horizon. The week in Emerson's house marked the end of his controlling influence on Emma's life and work. Soon, writing after his death, she would compound enduring admiration with thoughtful criticism of his "lack of lyric spontaneity," and of the "peculiarities of structure" which made his poems formless—"for him," she remarked, "Shelley and Poe were distinctly not poets. Music seemed a sealed volume to him. . . . He had little acquaintance with Heine. . . ."

We always return to our first loves, say the French. In withdrawing from Emerson, Emma resumed her childhood attempts to grasp Heine. Her new translation of his poems appeared in 1881, but again Dr. Gottheil frowned at her failure to see the poet from the Jewish point of view.

IN THE first days of August, 1881, Miss Lazarus joined a group of New York women on a visit to Ward's Island. There, in the East River opposite Upper Manhattan, a shipload of Jews had been landed from a tramp steamer on July 29th and were now waiting to be let into America. They were about two hundred and fifty men, women and children—a tiny fraction of the hundreds of thousands caught in the Russian pogroms and the unwitting vanguard of a historic migration.

To the historian of anti-Semitic violence, the Russian pogroms of those years mark an interesting halfway point between the Crusades and Hitler. Still unleashed by the ritual-murder fairy tale, still carried out by

mobs as primitive as the medieval followers of John the Hermit, they were already being fomented by official newspapers and shrugged off as "spontaneous illegalities" by a government which charged the victims dearly for the privilege of fleeing abroad. The civilized world, then, was horrified by what went on in Russia. The dignified *Times* of London wrote, "These persecutions, these oppressions, these cruelties, these outrages have taken every form of atrocity in the experience of mankind, or which the resources of the human tongue can describe." America, too, was horrified. There were protest meetings, and the press ran sympathetic editorials when the first few Russian Jews reached New York Harbor. On Ward's Island they were visited by intellectuals and humanitarians, and the chances are that Miss Emma Lazarus went to see these bits of human flotsam without a thought of the earlier emigrants who had become the fathers of a Jewish aristocracy.

Presumably, in her inbred Sephardic pride, she expected to find them of a rather low class—suitable alms-recipients. Instead, in the bare sheds of the small island she was shocked to see "huddled together men of brilliant talents and accomplishments—the graduates of Russian universities, scholars of Greek as well as Hebrew, and familiar with all the principal European tongues—engaged in menial drudgery and burning with zeal in the cause of their wretched co-religionists."

For the first time, Miss Lazarus actually faced persecuted people. For the first time she saw a picture surpassing the liveliest poetic imagination. She did not always understand what these Jews were saying, but in their eyes she read of lingering despair and fear of death. They were like men just released from dark cells and only with difficulty adjusting themselves to the new light. And yet these poor wrecks were not thinking of themselves—no, they were "burning with zeal in the cause of their wretched co-religionists."

At that moment the ivory tower collapsed. What no professed pride in her "blood

and lineage," no orthodox upbringing, no religious teacher, no literary friend had been able to bring about was accomplished by a first sight of the persecuted and reviled: Emma recognized her heritage. The young American woman of letters to whom the "Hebrew ideals did not appeal," who felt "no religious fervor in her soul," who had so long, firmly and successfully striven to rid herself of Jewish influences, suddenly felt an indissoluble bond between herself and the people chosen to suffer.

It was a great change that came over her at thirty-three. It did not only affect her Judaism; it changed her work, her character, her life. In the fifteen years of her literary career she had written just two books of verse, one novel and a play, and translated some poems; now, in the single year of 1882, she wrote as much—and all of it superior to her previous output. She had been timid, fearful of argument, self-critical to a fault, always inclined to heed the opinions of others; now she plunged into heated public debate, fought with the bold and confident skill of a gladiator and spoke the truth, requiring no one any more to help her see it. She had been disconsolate about having accomplished "nothing to stir, to awaken, to teach or suggest," and had quoted Emerson to show that the "epochs of life" were not in the "visible facts." But it was the stark, visible fact of the rescued Jews on Ward's Island that in one year made a world figure out of the eclectic New York lyricist and bound her name up forever with the greatest man-made symbol of freedom.

It was in an old play that Emma Lazarus found the best, briefest statement of her conversion. She put it as motto at the head of her first ringing article of protest. It had but two lines:

*Let us thank the Lord, who made us those
To suffer, not to do this deed.*

IN APRIL 1882 *Century Magazine* brought out a very interesting issue.

To begin with, it contained the last printed work of the old Emma Lazarus. It

was an essay on Lord Beaconsfield, in which the authoress took up Georg Brandes' contention that the British statesman and writer was no representative Jew and came to the conclusion that he was one. In Emma's eyes, Disraeli's many facets only reflected the many facets of Jewry, whose gamut runs from Shylock to Spinoza. "Whether or not the Jews are capable of growth," wrote the child of Moses Lazarus, the sugar merchant, "the next hundred years will show"—thus for the last time incurring Rabbi Gottheil's displeasure—and, also for the last time, she emphasized the importance of "the poetic idea rather than the dead prosaic fact."

Then, in its "Topics of the Time" column, the April *Century* carried excerpts from a speech made on February 4th in New York's Chattering Hall by former Secretary of State William B. Evarts, at a mass protest meeting against the Russian pogroms, under the chairmanship of ex-President Grant, and with prominent clergymen taking part to show that the voice of America was raised without distinction of creed. Mr. Evarts quoted figures from the London *Times* report—exact, appalling figures: "300 houses and 60 shops were plundered at Warsaw while a garrison of 20,000 soldiers was kept within barracks—and that on the morning when in the name of Christ peace and good will were proclaimed over all earth." He said, "Without forgetting the glass-house in which we ourselves live—we who have seen anti-Negro riots in New York and anti-Chinese riots at San Francisco—it must still be said that Russia's duty is to civilize herself. For it must be remembered that the Jews everywhere are, in great measure, what they are made by the people among whom their lot is cast."

The *Century's* editor made no use of these words in drawing attention to the most startling feature of his April issue, although they would have been apt indeed. Instead, he stressed the "extraordinary character" of the contribution, conceded that the charges raised in it had "a medieval aspect" and felt obliged to announce that they were to be answered in another article scheduled for

the next issue. The extraordinary article, entitled "Russian Jews and Gentiles" and signed by a Madame Ragozin, proposed to analyze the pogroms from "the Russian point of view."

Madame Ragozin (not yet as well known as when she later collaborated on the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion") first told the facts of the pogroms briefly, with a slight smirk but still with seeming objectivity. She then asked what might cause "this singularly tenacious phenomenon" of the people's wrath turning ever again on the Jews? It could not be mere bigotry, as claimed by the "so-called progressive and liberal" press—for there were millions of Mohammedans in Russia, and no one ever heard of outbreaks against them. In fact, far from bigoted, the lady found the Russian majority "strictly logical" in its anti-Semitism—that is to say, "ruled by irresistible hidden currents of its life."

"The Jews torture us," had been the Christians' cry. Clearly, the fault lay with the Jews. They were and remained a foreign body and it was as such that they were attacked. They were despised, according to Madame Ragozin, "because they will not stand up for themselves and manfully resent an insult or oppose vexation, but will take any amount if they can thereby turn a penny." And the "good-natured mob," provoked to direct action by these alien traits, did not even seek the Jews' lives—unless, of course, they tried to keep their ill-gotten gains by force. Next Madame digressed upon the "dualism in this singular people's life" and tolerantly conceded that there were "Jews of two descriptions: those who saw God and those who worshipped the golden calf, those who followed Jesus and those who crucified him, the thinkers and the sticklers, Spinoza and his persecutors." In summing up she proposed a perfectly simple solution of the Jewish question: the Jews should be forbidden the exercise of all their rituals and customs, and then received into the community. Little wonder that the American editor called Madame's article "extraordinary."

Still, her diatribe was not seized upon by hate-mongering groups of the kind which would do so today—mainly, perhaps, because they were not yet in business. By and large, the America of the eighties was a tolerant country and the Russian bigot's was a lost voice, the very sounding of which might now be forgotten but for the rebuttal that the *Century* published in May, over the signature of Emma Lazarus.

For it was this reply that testified to Emma's conversion. She prefaced it with the two old lines of thanks to God for having made her race the anvil, not the hammer, of oppression.

"The dualism of the Jews," she answered Madame's quasi-philosophical speculation on that subject, "is the dualism of humanity. They are made up of the good and the bad. Immortal genius and moral purity, as exemplified by Moses and Spinoza, constitute a minority among the Jews as they do among the Gentiles—but here ends the truth of the matter."

Emma, who in the past had so often lost herself in unreality and floundered for lack of an adequate expression, suddenly became clear, articulate, concise and convincing in factual, logical polemics. Was the "good-natured" mob to be praised for sparing the Jews' lives unless they resisted, and were the Jews at the same time to be blamed for not standing up for themselves? They were denied the protection of the law; it was "vain to expect the virtues of free men from a community of slaves." She quoted Heine—"Every country has the Jews she deserves"—and backed him up against the Russian Christian lady, with the opinion of an American Christian minister who called it "the glory of America that she finds among her Israelites the purest and strongest elements of republican liberty."

Madame asked why there were no anti-Mohammedan outbreaks. Emma pointed to Russia's Islamic neighbors, the Ottoman Empire, Persia, India—if the Mussulmen got better treatment, they owed it to the powers ready to protect them from Russia's type of Christian love. The Jews "tortured"

the Christians who outnumbered them by tens of millions? Should the all-powerful majority "have no other weapon than tyranny, violence, murder, to preserve them against the Jew who has nothing but his wits?"

This was not a defense of the Russian Jews. It was a ringing protest against persecution, any persecution. It closed with a passage from Mr. Evarts' Chattering Hall speech: "Americans need to consider only one ground upon which to base their attitude. It is not the oppression of the Jews by Russians; it is the oppression of men and women by men and women. And we are men and women." Emma was attacking in the first great polemical utterance of her career; she did not even deign to discuss the Ragozin "solution" of the Jewish question, and so the nature of the new ideal for which she was fighting did not yet clearly emerge.

She was to make it clear soon, in another medium. She still was a poetess. And so it was in her first ardent song of liberty that Emma Lazarus answered the proposal to make the Jews' reception into the community conditional on the suppression of their religious freedom. The poem—called, *In Exile*, and published that year in her volume, *Songs of a Semite*—bore at its head some lines from a letter sent to her by a Russian refugee in Texas: ". . . now our life is one unbroken paradise. We live a true, brotherly life. Every evening after supper we take a seat under the mighty oak and sing our songs." Then, for the first time knowing whereof she spoke, Emma spoke about freedom:

FREEDOM to love the law that Moses brought,
To sing the songs of David and to think
The thoughts Gabirol to Spinoza taught;
FREEDOM to dig the common earth, to drink
The universal air—for this they sought
Refuge o'er wave and continent to link
Egypt with Texas in their mystic chain
And truth's perpetual lamp forbid to wane.

Before the year was out, Emma Lazarus was the Jewish poet of her time, "the sweet singer of Israel."

Besides *Songs of a Semite*, she wrote in the remaining months a tragedy, *The Dance to Death*, about the medieval persecutions of the Jews and dedicated it to their modern Christian champion, George Eliot. She took up Hebrew in order fully to understand her heritage, the great tradition from which she had turned before; instead of a Hebrew primer she studied poetry by long-dead men like Ibn Gabirol and Jehuda Halevi, and Dr. Philip Cohen eagerly published her first translations of them in his *American Hebrew*. When the Jewish cemetery at Newport moved Longfellow to write,

And the dead nations never rise again—

Emma took up the cudgels for her rediscovered people and replied in *The New Ezekiel*:

*The Spirit is not dead; proclaim the word,
Where lay dead bones, a host of armed men stand;
I ope your graves, my people, saith the Lord,
And I shall place you living in your land.*

This promise, in fact, soon became her main concern. Whether moved by a thought which she had passingly touched upon in her reply to Mme. Ragozin—the Jews' lack of a powerful real nation to bar their maltreatment elsewhere—or just in consequence of her discovery of her people: she became what would now be called an ardent Zionist. However, to her the fight for a Jewish homeland was not a reason to close her own country's doors; for

*In two divided streams the exiles part:
One rolling homeward to its ancient source,
One rushing sunward, with fresh will, new heart—*

it was the young, vigorous, pioneering element among the refugees that she felt should

be directed to the New World, to mutual benefit. Emma engaged in numerous, far-flung activities, all of them new to her and unaccustomed. She arranged group meetings of prominent American Jews, to discuss ways of solving the Eastern Jewish question. She joined in representations to the State Department. She took an interest in the physical rehabilitation of Jewish youth. She helped found the Jewish Technical Institute. She formulated her demands on and for the Jews in sixteen *Epistles to the Hebrews*, which Philip Cohen published.

The circle in which she moved changed radically in the course of one year. Her friends and correspondents had once been selected literary figures; now they were Jewish leaders or Christian champions of the Jewish cause, like Evarts and Lawrence Oliphant, a leading advocate of Jewish nationhood. The name of Emma Lazarus suddenly had meaning far beyond the community of the poets. It became a clarion call for Jews everywhere, ringing most clearly among those who were the most cruelly oppressed. She had more than made good her once so negative promise: "I shall always be loyal to my race."

All at once Emma Lazarus found a tremendous influence thrust upon her. She could be the organizer of a new Exodus—covering not just the few hundred miles from Egypt to the Promised Land but starting in scores of Egypts ruled by tyrants far more refined than Pharaoh, spanning oceans and continents by the most diverse means of transportation and ending, besides Palestine, in scores of "more enlightened and progressive countries." She could be the voice of Jewry. But she did not relish the position.

She was concerned with ideas; their realization, she felt, was properly the province of others. With public interest hardly focussed upon her, she wished to get back to the "silent thoughts by the wayside." She wanted to get away, for a short while at least, from the scene of her increasing fame. And significantly it was not Palestine which now attracted her, but Western Europe,

from which the ideas of liberty and human rights had first come to the New World. To salve her conscience, Emma announced her intention of winning intellectual leaders in England and France for the Jewish cause. But this was not the real reason why she went overseas in May 1885 with Josephine, her favorite sister.

AT THIRTY-FOUR, with the enthusiasm of a child, she embarked on her first Atlantic crossing. At sundown of the sixth day—it was "a vision of beauty from morning till night"—she experienced "the great sensation: land. First like the ghost of a ship—two or three widely scattered rocks, which were promontories of Ireland."

At Liverpool she was met by prominent English Jewish leaders. But her great cause quickly faded into the background before the impression which every bit of England made on her American eyes. "Most ordinary objects," she wondered, "bewitch us back into a dream world of a previous existence." Never, save in books, had she encountered centuries of tradition. "An ivied wall, a pebbled brook, a lattice-windowed cottage, a single-arched stone bridge"—everything brought back "a thousand haunting memoirs of Shakespeare, Spenser, Shelley, Milton and Keats," and her English friends were perpetually surprised by the "easily excited enthusiasm" of their American visitor. She went to Chester and its "quaint, picturesque streets" reminded her of Scott's novels. But London bewildered her; "the whirl of people, sights, impressions" became too much to bear. Emma fled to Paris.

Paris was fascinating—and frightening. The close relation of the present and long bygone centuries, which comes naturally to people reared and living amid the mute witnesses of the past, was utterly strange to the young woman from New York. She spent July 4th on Bastille Square and vividly imagined its gory past. She saw "ruins on every side in Paris—of the Commune, or the siege, or the Revolution." In the end she found only one word for the City of Light: "terrible."

With this designation she left Paris—without taking notice of her favorite poet's favorite goddess, the Venus de Milo, or of the waiting Statue of Liberty. She actually rushed out of France, and only regained her composure at the first glimpse of "mellow England" over the Channel. There, at least, the mementos of the past were restful, stimulating to the mind rather than upsetting to the emotions—though Emma, socially conscious since her trip to Ward's Island and her subsequent discoveries, found "inequality more glaring, the pressure of the densely crowded population upon the means of subsistence more painful. In America"—she noted in contrast—"the need for higher culture, finer taste, a more solidly constructed social basis were much more conspicuous than the inequality of conditions."

IN THE late summer of 1883 Emma and Josephine came back to the United States. There hardly was time for getting settled at home. Demands, in the name of the cause to which she had devoted herself in the past year, had mounted during Emma's absence into a staggering pile of letters, circulars and visiting cards. One of the letters, written by ex-Secretary Evarts on stationery of the American Committee for the Statue of Liberty, was addressed to Emma Lazarus, the poetess: she was asked to donate a poem to the "Art Loan Collection" in behalf of the Pedestal Fund. Since Mr. Evarts had written not as a friend but in his capacity as committee chairman, Emma felt free to give her stock reply. She regretted being "unable to write to order. . . ."

Having mailed her refusal, however, she found the thought of what she had been asked to do still in her mind. She had not gone to see the statue in Paris, but its form was familiar to her from drawings and photographs; and now she saw it before her roving mind's eye—not in its actual dreary surroundings in a Parisian working-class quarter, baseless, half-hidden by scaffolding—but high and free and glorious on the wonderfully chosen site which Emma had

viewed some days earlier, from the deck of a ship. And the picture of the homeless fugitives on Ward's Island returned, and that of the shocking squalor of the English proletarians, and that of the palaces and ruins of France, breathing the odor of a dead past; and each somehow seemed to have a bearing on the figure that was soon to rise on the bare rocks out in the Bay.

They had a name for it: "Liberty Enlightening the World." What liberty? The important men who had conceived it had even held different views on the issue of Negro slavery in the United States; their minds were kept strictly on their own versions of liberty, and by defining the activity of their ideals as "enlightenment" they implied that they did not see it as necessarily doing more. It took a woman—an American poetess newly fired with the passion to save oppressed people—to see that liberty had to extend to all who needed it and that it had to help, not just to enlighten.

Emma Lazarus was truly unable to write to order. It was not to order, or by deliberation—it was from sheer inner compulsion that she wrote a sonnet on "The New Colossus" and sent it to the Hon. William B. Evarts two days after declining his request.

In her sonnet she gave the monument a meaning that had occurred to none of its sponsors on either side of the Atlantic; "Mother of Exiles" she called the figures, and:

. . . From her beacon hand
Glow world-wide welcome; her mild eyes
command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities
frame.
"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!"
cries she
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your
poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe
free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

THE BRITISH GENERAL ELECTION

GEORGE ORWELL

LONDON

THE Labor Party's victory was overwhelming. It has a clear majority of more than 150 seats over all other parties combined, while the Conservatives and their satellites have lost nearly 200 seats and the minor parties have been simply obliterated. So far as I know, not a soul in England foresaw any such outcome. Before the election began, my own forecast had been a small Tory majority, and after polling day — this as a result of observing the strong leftward swing in the London area — a small Labor majority. Most of the people I know were of the same way of thinking, while the newspapers alternated between giving the Tories a majority of about 50, and predicting a stalemate. The Liberals, who put up 300 candidates, were expected to increase their representation considerably (actually it has dwindled from 18 seats to 10), and most of the discussion between polling day and the announcement of the results turned on what would happen if there were a minority government and the Liberals had the casting vote. The belief that the election would be a very near thing, and that we should be left with a weak government which would be forced to form some kind of coalition, was almost universal. Before giving any opinion as to what this landslide means, I should like

to record the impressions I picked up while the election was on.

I saw the election only in London, but I followed its developments fairly closely, as I was "covering" the London constituencies for a Sunday paper. The thing that principally struck me, as it struck others who were watching events in the streets and not in the newspapers, was that the masses were not interested. It is true that a high percentage voted (actually higher than it seems, since hundreds of thousands of people were disenfranchised owing to defects in the electoral register), but people always do vote in a general election, as opposed to a by-election, because of the last-minute pressure put upon them by newspapers and radio.

DURING a fortnight of electioneering, in which most of my waking hours were spent in the streets or in pubs, buses and tea-shops, with my ears pricked all the time, I only twice overheard a spontaneous comment on the election. Outdoor meetings, especially in the more crowded and noisy parts of London, were often a complete failure. Indoors, in church halls, schools and dance-palaces, you had lively and sometimes very turbulent meetings of five hundred or a thousand people, but in the streets the great crowds drifted to and fro as usual, seemingly indifferent to the whole thing and never, in my experience, stopping to look at the election posters which were pasted all over the walls. Nearly all the agents and organizers whom I interviewed remarked on the difficulty of canvassing and the impossibility of finding out what the masses were thinking. Canvassers reported that "I haven't made up my mind yet" was a frequent answer. There was also a certain amount of feeling that there ought not to have been an election at this time, i.e., when the Japanese end of the war was uncom-

GEORGE ORWELL is recognized as one of the most acute observers of the British scene today. An intellectual and a man of action, the writer joined the POUM militia during the Spanish civil war, served with the British Home Guard and worked for the B.B.C. during the recent conflict, and has been literary editor of the independent labor London *Tribune*. As a literary critic, he is a frequent contributor to the English magazine *Horizon*. Since 1928 Mr. Orwell has published 10 or 12 books, of which the better known are *Burmese Days*, *Inside the Whale*, a volume of critical essays, *The Road to Wigan Pier* and *Homage to Catalonia*. He is now at work on a new novel.

pleted, and both Tory and Labor candidates did their best to transfer the odium of "forcing" the election on to the other party.

ON THE other hand, among the minority who did take an interest, I was struck by the comparative seriousness and decency with which the whole thing was conducted. The behavior of candidates and audiences seemed to me a good deal better than the behavior of the press. It is so long since we have had a general election in England that people have forgotten the libels and buffooneries that used to be taken for granted, and there were angry protests from some quarters that Britain was presenting an undignified spectacle to Europe. Actually I believe that this election was an exceptionally quiet and an exceptionally clean one, and several party agents with long experience confirmed this. The only real attempt to drag the contest down to the level of 1931 or 1924 was the short-lived campaign of the Beaverbrook press against Professor Laski. This failed even to become an election issue, and was simply one more demonstration of the inability of the big press lords to influence public opinion by direct means. So far as my observation went, anti-Semitism was not a factor in the election, and certainly no overt attempt at stirring up anti-Semitism was made in the press, though the Laski affair could obviously have been given some such twist. (Anti-Semitism, although it is probably on the upgrade, isn't really a political issue at all in England, and can't be made to appear so when there is no Fascist party functioning. There are Jews in all political parties, though they are distributed a bit thicker in the parties of the left, and there were Jewish candidates on all the tickets. Incidentally, the one new Communist who got in—they now have two seats—was a Jew, but as he was elected in what is practically an all-Jewish quarter of London and his Labor opponent was also a Jew, it's a bit difficult to see deep significance in this.)

At public meetings, the attempts to shout down the speakers were usually the work of small groups of Communists or near-

Communists, who were countered with similar tactics by small groups of Conservatives. All the Labor Party meetings I went to were quiet and serious, and the level of the questions asked was fairly high. Much the worst feature of the election, if one regards it in broad terms, was the exploitation of Churchill's record and personality by the Conservatives. But in the end this recoiled against themselves, and the leader-worship and ballyhoo were nothing to what goes on in Continental countries. Symptomatically, the photographs of Churchill which were plastered everywhere were only about a quarter the size of the photographs of Stalin, de Gaulle, etc., which are to be seen in the appropriate parts of Europe.

THE third thing that struck me was that this election was fought almost wholly on domestic issues. This ought to be emphasized, because such foreign press comments as I have seen hitherto point to serious misconception. Obviously, the Labor Party and the Conservative Party stand for quite different policies, and British policy all over the world will be affected by the change of government: but the mass of the electorate, during the actual struggle, showed no interest in anything outside the British isles. The war with Japan, foreign policy, relations with the U.S.A., the Dominions, Palestine and India were not election issues. Even relations with the USSR only had an indirect effect because of the widespread vague belief that a Labor government would "get on better with Russia." The questions on which the election turned were nationalization of industry, social security, demobilization, housing, old age pensions, continuation of wartime controls and also of wartime facilities such as day nurseries, and the raising of the school-leaving age. The Conservatives, unable simply to keep silent about home affairs, were forced to come out openly as the champions of *laissez-faire*, and did their best to make this policy a little more acceptable by tying Churchill's name to it. They would have liked to put more emphasis on the Pacific war and the need to recapture Britain's

foreign markets, but their audiences would not let them. Labor candidates sometimes talked as though Britain's internal prosperity need be in no way affected by the outside world. Significantly, the handbook issued to Labor speakers gives, out of its 218 pages, only a single rather uninformative page to India.

THESE were my main impressions, and I think many other observers would confirm them. But now one must ask, what did this nationwide swing to the Left actually mean?

The first thing to notice is that in terms of votes the swing was not nearly so big as it looks if one considers it in terms of seats. The English electoral system is capable of producing all kinds of anomalies, and would in theory be capable of giving every single seat in Parliament to a party which had won only 51 per cent of the votes. Over the past twenty-five years—largely because the rural areas, where people used to vote Conservative, were over-represented—the anomalies have worked in the Conservative interest, and it has needed many more votes to elect a Labor man than to elect a Conservative. In the present election the position has been reversed, and it has needed, on average, 46,000 votes to elect a Conservative and only 30,000 to elect a Labor man. The upshot is that though Labor has won 392 seats as against 195 won by the Conservatives, the number of votes won was roughly 12 million as against 9 million. If one takes into account the minor parties which can be lumped with one or other of the two main ones, then the figures are approximately twelve and a half millions and ten millions: which means that the preponderance of votes was in the ratio of six and a half to five, while the preponderance of seats was in the ratio of two to one.

There were various complicating factors which should be mentioned but are not worth discussing in detail, since they probably did not alter the over-all result. The most important were the large-scale intervention of the Liberals (who polled over 2 million votes though they only won 10 seats),

and the very large number of "lost" votes, nearly all of them working-class votes, due to the bad state of the electoral register and the inadequate facilities for men and women serving overseas. (Men and women in the services could vote either by post or by proxy. Many who had applied to vote by post did not get their voting papers in time, while others had not been adequately informed by their unit commanders about the steps it would be necessary to take beforehand. This may not have been entirely due to carelessness. The non-commissioned ranks in all three services would mostly vote Labor if they voted at all.) According to the very rough calculations that I have been able to make, the wastage of votes on one side and on the other would either cancel out, or would slightly benefit the Conservatives.

Had Proportional Representation been in force in England, the division of votes would have given Labor about 300 seats, the Conservatives and their satellite parties about 250 seats, and the Liberals 55 seats. This is to say that the Labor Party would not have had a reliable working majority: and similarly, on a basis of Proportional Representation, the Conservatives would hardly have had a working majority after the election of 1935. In that election the Conservatives polled something over 10 million votes and the Labor Party something over 8 million. If one compares the figures for 1935 and 1945, it can be seen that a comparatively small turn-over of votes may bring about a complete reversal of the political situation. This often means that the House of Commons is not genuinely representative of the electorate, but it does have the advantage of producing governments which are strong enough to act but which can be fairly easily got rid of when their five-years' term is over.

In the present election, the defeat of the Conservatives is sufficiently accounted for by two things that were bound to happen sooner or later: the penetration of the Labor Party into the rural areas, and the defection of the middle class. Labor members have been returned by rustic constituencies and by prosperous "dormitory suburbs" where

only ten years ago it would have been quite hopeless for any leftwing candidate to present himself. But though I have emphasized above that the turnover of votes is not enormous, the general drift in England is leftward, as innumerable observers have pointed out from 1940 onwards. In spite of the general apathy and ignorance, there is a gathering discontent which cannot be fitted into any "ism" but which springs from a desire for more dignity and decency in everyday life, more opportunities for the young, and, above all, more security.

It would be absurd to imagine that Britain is on the verge of violent revolution, or even that the masses have been definitely converted to Socialism. Most of them don't know what Socialism means, though public opinion is quite ready for essentially socialistic measures such as nationalization of mines, railways, public utilities, and land. Again, it is doubtful whether there is any widespread desire for complete social equality. There is considerable class feeling, which is never quite dormant and sometimes sharpens to acute resentment, but if a plebiscite could be taken, the mass of the people would not vote for rigid equalization of incomes, nor for the abolition of the monarchy, nor even, possibly, for the abolition of hereditary titles. The Labor Party, in the average man's mind, does not stand for republicanism, and still less does it stand for red flags, barricades and reigns of terror: it stands for full employment, free milk for school-children, old-age pensions of thirty shillings a week, and, in general, a fair deal for the working man.

The same drift towards the Left, not accompanied by any strong revolutionary yearnings or any sudden break-up of class system, can be observed in France. Recently, after the municipal elections in which half the electorate of Paris voted either Communist or Socialist, it appeared to me that Paris was in fact less revolutionary, more pre-1939 in outlook, even than London. People voted for the Left partly because the collaborators had belonged to the Right, but above all because the Left stood for social security. In England the mythos of the USSR and the

victories of the Red Army have been helpful to the Labor Party, but there is little real interest in the Soviet system. Russia is dimly thought of as a country where "they" (the upper classes) do not usurp all the privileges and where there is no unemployment. After the experience of the between-wars years, mass unemployment—unemployment against a background of social competitiveness—is the worst horror the English people can imagine, and they have turned towards the Labor Party because, more convincingly than its opponents, it promised a way out.

Meanwhile, unless it suffers a major split, the Labor Party has a completely free hand for five years. Just like any other government at this time, it will have to do unpopular things: it will have to continue with military conscription, to "direct" labor into hated jobs such as coal-mining, to crush sabotage on both Right and Left, to soothe the inevitable disappointments over demobilization and rehousing, and, in general, to clean up the mess left over from the war. But it starts out with great advantages, especially in dealing with foreign affairs. It has no strong motive for backing up such indefensible figures as Franco or King George of Greece, and on the other hand it is not obliged to adopt an appeaser attitude towards the USSR. At some point or another a stand against Russian aggression will have to be made, and when the moment comes a Labor government will be able to unite the country behind it, which a Conservative government for obvious reasons could not. It is, I believe, a mistake to imagine that the new government's foreign policy will be diametrically opposed to that of the old one.

A Labor government will approach such problems as the occupation of Germany with more common sense than has been shown hitherto, it will look with a friendlier eye on the Italian Socialists and the Spanish Republicans, and it will go somewhat further towards satisfying Jewish aspirations in Palestine: but Britain's strategic interests, in a world of competing nationalisms, remain the same, whether the government at home is called Socialist or capitalist.

BY FAR the hardest problem for a Labor government—and it is all the harder because the mass of the people never give the subject a thought—is India. The Labor Party will now have to decide, once and for all, whether the promises it has made to India are to be kept or broken. It cannot simply postpone the question as a Conservative government might succeed in doing, because with Labor in power the Indian Nationalists will expect a decision promptly.

Underneath this problem lies the fact I mentioned above—that the election was fought on domestic issues and that the bulk of the British people are almost completely uninterested in foreign or imperial affairs. Immersed in their struggle with the Tories, the Labor leaders have never made clear to their followers the extent to which British prosperity depends on the exploitation of the colored peoples. It has always been tacitly pretended that we could “set India free” and raise our own wages simultaneously. The first task of the Labor government is to make people realize that Britain is not self-contained, but is part of a world-wide network. Even the problem of introducing Socialism is secondary to that. For Britain cannot become a genuinely Socialist country while continuing to plunder Asia and Africa; while on the other hand no amount of nationalization, no cutting-out of profits and destruction of privilege, could keep up our standard of living if we lost all our markets and our sources of raw materials at one blow. It is not yet certain whether the Labor Party will make a genuine effort to introduce Socialism: but if it does, the period of reconstruction will probably be a very uncomfortable one for almost everyone. By its success or otherwise in educating people for that period, in making them see that it has to be faced, just as the war had to be faced, the Labor Party will stand or fall.

The most difficult moment will probably be about two years hence, when the war boom is over and demobilization is complete. But the Labor government has at least five years in hand, and the men at the top of it, as a body, are at least as able and determined

as any government we have had for decades past. It is too early to cheer, but a hopeful attitude is justified. As a sign of the vitality of democracy, of the power of the English-speaking peoples to get along without *fuehrers*, the outcome of this election is a thing to be rejoiced at, even if the men it has brought to power should utterly fail.

RIGHT NOW Parliament is in recess, and though the ministerial appointments were made some time back, there has not as yet been any statement of policy. The government has addressed a not-too-friendly note to the Greek government, there have been shufflings in Spain which may be partly due to British pressure, and a Secretary of State for India has been appointed, which suggests that the India Office is *not* to be abolished. Otherwise there is nothing very revealing.

So far as foreign policy goes, no very violent or sudden change should be expected because of Labor's accession to power. The Labor Party has to play out the hand left to it by its predecessor, and one must remember that the Labor leaders helped to frame, or at any rate concurred in, Churchill's policy. In the matter of Greece, for instance, the people at the top of the Labor Party are very much less favorable to EAM than the rank and file. So also with Yugoslavia, Poland, the Baltic states, Finland and Turkey. With regard to all these countries there is a sort of left-wing orthodoxy which is accepted unreservedly by the big mass of Labor Party supporters, and which is perhaps best expressed by the *Liberal News-Chronicle*. One has only to look back two or three years at the earlier speeches and writings of the men who now form the government, to realize that their views on foreign policy are not always what their followers imagine. A Labor government has not the same motive as a Conservative one for automatically backing reaction everywhere, but its first consideration must be to guard British strategic interests, which are the same whatever government is in power. Ernest Bevin, the new Foreign Minister, is

a very much tougher person than Anthony Eden.

The one part of the world, outside Britain, in which the Labor government's policy *may* diverge sharply from that of its predecessor is Palestine. The Labor Party is firmly committed to the establishment of the Jewish National Home, and indeed almost all shades of radical opinion in England are "pro-Jewish" on the Palestine issue. I think it would be rash, however, to assume that the

Labor government will live up to the promises it made when it was in opposition. Left-wing opinion in England is pro-Jewish partly because the Arab case gets no hearing, and it is not always realized that the colored peoples almost everywhere are pro-Arab. Unreserved support of the Jews might have repercussions in the other Arab countries, in Egypt and even in India, of a kind that a newly-elected government could hardly be expected to face.

CEDARS OF LEBANON

With this essay by Franz Rosenzweig, the sixteenth in the series of "The Cedars of Lebanon," COMMENTARY continues a feature of the Contemporary Jewish Record that its late editor Dr. Adolph S. Oko initiated and shaped with such rich result. We reproduce the words in which Dr. Oko set forth the purpose of the series:

"... to republish a series of classic essays on the fundamental ideals underlying Jewish life and inherent in Jewish thought. . . . Naturally, the essays were written from a particular point of view and in a particular way. The point of view was that of the modern man; and the way was that of intellectual freedom. There is nothing provincial or parochial about the essays. Through them all, like a golden thread, runs the conviction that Judaism is one of the big and important things in the spiritual history of the world. But the writers were never hortatory."

COMMENTARY hopes to continue the "Cedars" along the same lines projected and followed by Dr. Oko, and on the same high level.

XVI

ON BEING A JEWISH PERSON

FRANZ ROSENZWEIG

FRANZ ROSENZWEIG was born in Cassel, Germany, in 1886, of rich and more or less assimilated parents. An aesthete in his early youth, he became as he grew older more and more interested in philosophy and religion. Estranged by the emptiness of "Mosaic confession" Judaism, he was for a time attracted to Christianity, but before taking any final steps decided to investigate the foundations of the religion he was about to leave. The investigation became a loving one and the investigator a conscious and ardent Jew. Soon Rosenzweig went to study under Hermann Cohen in Berlin, where he also came in contact with Martin Buber. Later, while serving at the front with the German army in World War I, he wrote his main philosophical work, *The Star of Redemption*, on postcards mailed home to his family.

Immediately after the war he, with Hermann Cohen, was instrumental in founding an academy for Jewish studies in Berlin. Rosen-

zweig was stricken with paralysis in 1922 but insisted on continuing his activities, as a philosopher in general and a Jewish teacher and leader in particular, from his bed. During the remaining years of his life he became a legendary figure. He carried on a heavy correspondence, engaged in discussions, translated and commented upon the poems of Judah Halevi, and in collaboration with Martin Buber undertook a new German translation of the Bible. His death interrupted these activities in 1929.

Rosenzweig received his philosophical stimuli from Hegel, Schelling and then, apparently, Kierkegaard. His insistence upon viewing as the central problem the plight of the individual in the immediate moment, here and now, between birth and death, serves to identify him with the "Existentialist" tendencies in philosophy that have gained such strength in Germany during the last thirty years, and more recently in France. It was more or less in line with these tendencies that he came to see his

chief task as a Jewish thinker in the re-definition of Judaism for modern times and for the modern individual.

The essay below stems from this preoccupation. It was addressed as an open letter—a form Rosenzweig favored—to Eduard Strauss in January 1920, and it forms a kind of sequel to an open letter addressed to Hermann Cohen three years before on the subject of Jewish religious instruction in the German public schools. The essay, the original title of which is “Bildung—und kein Ende” (quoted from Ecclesiastes 12:

THE state of the world today may force us to postpone many desirable things, not for a better day but for a better century. It could hardly be asserted that the great urgency at the present moment is to organize Jewish learning or to urge both Jews and non-Jews to the endless writing of books on Jewish subjects. Books are not now the prime need of the day. But what we need more than ever, or at least as much as ever, are human beings—Jewish human beings, to use a catchword that should be cleansed of the partisan associations still clinging to it.

This term should not be taken in its (apparently loose) meaning, which is actually a very narrow one—it should not be taken in what I would call the petty-Jewish sense that has been assigned to it by an exclusively political or even exclusively cultural Zionism. I mean it in a sense that, though certainly including Zionism, goes far beyond it. *The Jewish human being*—this does not mean a line drawn to separate us from other kinds of humanity. No dividing walls should rise here. A reality that only sheer stubbornness can deny shows that even within the individual many different spheres can touch or overlap. Yet sheer stubbornness and its counterpart, cowardly repudiation, seem indeed to be the two main features of our present-day Jewish life.

When the problem is posed in terms of the extremists—of the Zionists and the assimilationists—the only solution is the either-or of stubbornness and repudiation. But the Jewishness of a Jew is done an injustice if it is put on the same level as his nationality. One nationality—the German, for instance—is of necessity differentiated from other nationalities. The German nationality of a

12), was preferred by Rosenzweig himself to almost all his other occasional writings, and he said of it: “It was not written at all, it was almost danced. . . .” The ideas it expresses were later given practical embodiment in the *Freies Jüdische Lehrhaus*, which he and Rabbi Nehemiah Anton Nobel founded in the summer of 1920 in Frankfurt-am-Main, where Rosenzweig had finally settled. The letter as given in the translation below has been pruned here and there of references too local to the time and place, but otherwise stands complete.—EDITOR.

Jew excludes his being simultaneously of French or British nationality. A German is after all only a German, not a Frenchman or an Englishman too. Significantly enough, language itself resists the use of the phrase “a German man.” The relationship between a man’s German nationality and his humanity is one that philosophers of history may meditate upon—and it may be the task of living, advancing history to realize this relationship—but there is no “relationship” between a man’s Jewishness and his humanity that needs to be discovered, puzzled out, experienced or created. Here the situation is different: as Jew he is a human being, as human being, a Jew. One is a “jüdisch Kind” with every breath. It is something that courses through the arteries of our life, strongly or weakly, but at any rate to our very finger-tips. It may course very weakly indeed. But one feels that the Jew in him is no circumscribed territory bounded by other circumscribed territories but a greater or lesser force that floods his whole being.

And just as this force does not limit itself within the Jewish individual, so does it not limit that individual himself when he faces the outside world. On the contrary, it intensifies his humanity. Strange as it may sound to the stupid ears of the nationalist, being a Jew is no limiting barrier that cuts the Jew off from some one who is limited by being something else. The Jewish human being finds his limitation not in the Frenchman or German but only in another human being as unlimited as himself; the Christian or the heathen. Only against them can he measure himself. Only in them does he find individuals who claim to be and are as all-embracing as himself, above and beyond all divisions of nationality and state, ability

and character (for these too divide human beings from each other). His Judaism must, to the Jew, be no less comprehensive, no less all-pervasive, no less universal than Christianity is to the Christian human or heathenism to the heathen humanist.

BUT how? Doesn't this mean the resurrection of that old song, already played to death a hundred years ago, about Judaism as a "religion," as a "creed," the old expedient of a century that tried to tidily analyze the unity of the Jewish individual into a "religion" for several hundred rabbis and into a "creed" for several tens of thousands of respectable citizens? God keep us from putting on that old cracked record again—was it ever uncracked? No, what we mean by Judaism, the Jewishness of the Jewish human being, is nothing that can be grasped in a "religious literature" or even in a "religious life," nor can it be "entered" as one's "creed" in the civil registry of births, marriages and deaths. The point is simply that it is no entity, no subject among other subjects, no one sphere of life among other spheres of life, it is not what the century of emancipation with its cultural mania wanted to reduce it to. It is something inside the individual that makes him a Jew, something infinitesimally small yet immeasurably large, his most impenetrable secret, yet evident in every gesture and every word—especially in the most spontaneous of them. The Jewishness I mean is no "literature." It can be grasped through neither the writing nor the reading of books. It is not even—may all the contemporary-minded forgive me!—"experienced." It is only lived—and perhaps not even that. One is it.

One is Jewish. But of course Jewishness also exists in itself. And because it exists, because it already is here and was here before me and will remain when I am gone, therefore—but *only* therefore—it is also literature. Only for this reason are there problems of Jewish education. Literature is written only for the sake of those who are in the process of development and for the sake of that in each of us which is still developing. The Jewish language, knowing no word for "reading" that does not mean "learning" as well, has given this, the secret of all literature, away. For it is a secret, though a quite

open one, to these times of ours—obsessed and suffocated as they are by education—that books exist only to transmit that which has been achieved to those who are still developing. While that which is between the achieved and the developing, that which exists today, at this moment—life itself—needs no books. If I myself exist, why ask for something to "educate" me? But children come and ask, and the child in myself awakes—the child which doesn't as yet "exist" and doesn't "live"—and it asks and wants to be educated and to develop—into what? Into something living, into something that exists. But just here is where an end is put to the making of books.

For life stands between two periods of time, in the moment between the past and the future. The living moment itself puts an end to the making of books. But right next to it are the two realms of book-writing (past and future) and the two realms of education (past and future) where there is never any end to the making of books. No end is ever known by those who explore the past and to whom the moment means nothing until it has been nailed down in the showcase of the past, and who seek in the future only what can be imagined in terms of the past. And no end is ever known by the teachers of the coming generation, who use the moment only to open with their ardor the unawakened souls of the young, and who take from the past only what is teachable, only that which can find a place in the unlocked souls of the new generation. There is no end to learning, no end to education. Between these two burns the flame of the day; it is nourished by the limited fuel of the moment, but without its fire the future would remain closed and without its illumination the past would remain invisible.

JEWISH study and teaching, Jewish learning and education—they are dying out among us. This assertion may offend many ears, but in making it I feel myself one with the best among the youth, and among the old too—thank goodness for the last, for otherwise I should not feel sure of myself. Since the time of Mendelssohn and Zunz our Jewish learning has no longer had the courage to be itself, but instead runs at a respectful distance behind the learning of the "others." At a

respectful distance—what others find an old story is readily marvelled at among ourselves as the very latest thing—at least by the small (and rightly so) circle of those who still pay any attention at all to this dance of shadows. And what the sparrows chirp from the rooftops of intellectual Germany, to us still seems terrible heresy. Leaving the old ghetto, we have very speedily locked ourselves up in a new one. Only this time we do not want to admit it to ourselves. And this time we occupy ourselves with a learning that is just as little German and just as little Jewish as—well, as, for example, the “German” surnames our grandfathers adopted in the first dizziness of emancipation.

The situation is no better with respect to teaching. The trend towards conversion which every year takes away the best from among us, and not—as is again and again falsely asserted—the worst, can be blamed on our religious education. Max Brod’s verses on this subject in his great poem *To the Baptized Jews* are as true as prose. Certainly the individual is usually guiltless. Everything is connected with everything else in these matters. We have no teachers because we have no teaching profession; we have no teaching profession because we have no scholars; and we have no scholars because we have no learning. Teaching and study have both deteriorated. And they have done so because we lack that which gives animation to both science and education—life itself.

LIFE—A void, unfilled for over a century, yawns between the realm of education and that of the endless making of books. Emancipated Jewry lacks a platform of Jewish life upon which the bookless present could come into its own. Until emancipation such a platform was provided by existence within the bounds of old Jewish law, in the Jewish home and in the synagogal service. Emancipation shattered this platform. True, all three parts survive still, but because they are now only parts they are no longer what they were when they were joined together—the single platform of a real and contemporaneously lived life, which learning and education had but to serve and from which they drew their greatest strength.

Wherever the Law is still kept among

Western Jewry it is no longer a question of a “Jewishness” of life that, while based to a certain extent merely on legal precepts, is for the rest taken simply as a matter of course. This sort of Jewishness has taken on a polemical point which—altogether contrary to its original intent—is turned mainly, not against the outsider, but against the large majority of those within Jewry who no longer keep the Law. Today the Law distinguishes more sharply between Jew and Jew than between Jew and Gentile.

Just as the Law, blasted from its unity with home and worship, is no longer what it once was, so the two other planks of the platform are not what they used to be. And thus the Jewish home, where it is still maintained intact, is no longer the heart from which the bloodstream of all Jewish life is pumped and to which it returns. Slowly but surely the home has lost its dominating position in the Jewish existence. Life comes from outside and makes its own demands. The Jewish home can and probably will try to assert itself against the outside world, but the most it can still do is maintain itself. The unity between home and occupation has been destroyed beyond hope; and even the strictest Jewish orthodoxy is forced to initiate its pupils into two different worlds of education and to exaggerate the quite new and positive importance of the opposition between *Torah* and *derekh eretz* [way of the land, i.e. its customs, *mores*], which was of so little significance for the old Judaism. And thus the home has become at best but “one thing” in life, with “another thing” next to and outside itself. That “other thing”—one’s occupation, one’s public activity—is no longer the natural radiation of the home into the outside world; it obeys demands and laws of its own. The home no longer binds Jewish life into a unity.

And finally there is the synagogue. Thence at least a stream of Jewish life still seems to flow and though it is pitifully thin it does trickle through the modern Jew even if it does not wash over and around him. The most assimilated assimilationist does as a rule still take some part in its life, be it but for an hour’s “commemoration of the dead,” or for his marriage, or at least for his funeral. Those who know and have perhaps experienced personally what forces still slumber

in what I would term a mere Yom Kippur Jewishness—which many have held on to as the only coin in an inherited fortune that still retains its full value—will be careful not to speak disparagingly of the synagogue. But for the same reason that the Jewish home and the Law cannot become what they once were, the synagogue cannot become what it once was for our collective existence.

Even if it were possible—and I think it is!—to restore the synagogue's connection with the whole of life, bit by bit out of the small remnant of it which is all that many of us have left—the restored connection would be with a whole that is no longer a whole. For the synagogue no longer forms a member that rounds out the body of a living life; the beadle no longer knocks at house-doors to summon us to *shul*. And how many synagogues still have a study room with the heavy folios of the Law and its commentaries right next to the room of worship? The synagogue has now become, quite in keeping with the spirit of the culture-obsessed, pigeon-holing nineteenth century, a "place of religious edification" (or it at least claims to have become this). "Religion," to which life has denied a real place—and rightly, for life rightly rejects such lifeless, partial demands—seeks a safe, undisturbed little corner. And it is indeed a little corner: life flows past it unconcerned. Nor can the synagogue, either, do what the Law and the home cannot—give Jewry a platform of Jewish life.

What, then, holds or has held us together since the dawn of emancipation? In what does the community of our contemporary life show itself, that community which alone can lead from the traditional past to a living future? The answer is frightening. Since the beginning of emancipation only one thing has unified the German Jews in a so-called "Jewish life": emancipation itself, the Jewish struggle for equal rights. This alone includes all German Jews, and this alone includes only Jews. From this alone, therefore, the contemporary impulses will have to come that will open up the past to the seeking eyes of the student and open the future to the capacity for leadership of a determined will. Everybody knows what the true situation is. Here, really, is the final

reason why our Jewish learning and our Jewish education are in such a bad way. This struggle for equal rights—civil as well as social—has been the only actual "stimulant" our learning and our education have received from real life. Which is why neither one nor the other has been able to free itself from the soft-pedals of apologetics. Instead of feeling and teaching the enjoyment of that which is ours and characterizes us, they have again and again tried only to excuse it. And so we have come to our present pass.

ZIONISM, diagnostician of genius but very mediocre healer, has recognized the disease but prescribed the wrong treatment. What it recognized was the absence of a specific contemporary Jewish life that had other common characteristics to show beside the common possession of a dead scholarship called the "learning of Judaism" (with which no one was familiar) and the common "defense against anti-Semitism." What Zionism also recognized—and here it proved itself to be a real pathologist, not merely a diagnostician—is this: that the only healthy, the only whole thing about the Jewish person—is the Jewish person himself.

Expressly or unconsciously, Zionism has always emphasized that it is the integrity of the Jewish individual which has in reality held us together since the beginning and constituted the only solid ground upon which the several vessels of Jewish life could grow up—land, state and civil law in the old days; later, religious law, worship and home. But as soon as the great question is posed as to what should be done now and how new vessels of Jewish communal life are to be planted in this devastated but indestructible soil in place of the withered ones, so that, grafting themselves on to these new vessels, individuals can again feel the sap of the old, eternally inexhaustible stream course through their arteries—as soon as this question is asked Zionism fails us.

Zionism believes it can solve the present problems of European Jewry by finding the way out through a Palestinian future. But while it gazes spellbound at this escape from Europe it engages itself again and again in attempts to isolate as much as possible the Jewish individual of the "intermediate"

period. And the present is *always* an "intermediate" period. Since our salvation is seen only in the founding of an isolated state, let us begin, says Zionism, by isolating the Jewish individual here and now. Let there be artificially created for him inner as well as outer forms of extra-territoriality in Europe. He should be given the opportunity for Jewish hiking, Jewish gymnastics, Jewish talking, Jewish reading—even though he does live in Germany. Instead of a "portable homeland," as the old unity of Law, home and worship was so well called, the Jew is to be given a portable homelessness. This completely neo-Jewish desire to "lead a Jewish life nevertheless and in spite of . . ." can lead no further than to the certainty of one's feeling *not* at home in Europe. And according to Zionist intentions, it should lead no further than that; for it would go very much against the purposes of this sort of Zionist "Galuth" politics if a real and not a portable Jewish sense of belonging grew up as a result of its program in, say, the Jewish suburbs in Brandenburg or the Jewish agricultural settlements in Franconia.

Despite the Zionist desire to transform him in details, the Jewish individual, as the "exile" politics of Zionism wants exclusively to see him, is something completely negative, something self-limiting and therefore circumscribed. The universality, the wholeness, which Zionism too (at least in the person of its most mature thinkers) acknowledges to belong essentially to the Jewish individual, is to be restored to him only in another time and in another place. Zionism would repudiate itself were it to deprive its Galuth politics of this provisional character. Those who want to work for the moment, for today, without shifting the main burden to an uncertain tomorrow, cannot walk in the steps of Zionism. They must take the Jewish individual seriously, here and now as he is in his wholeness.

BUT how is this to be done? By beginning modestly—the only way one can begin with very large things that, one feels sure, must be all-inclusive or else cannot exist at all. What is intended to be of limited scope can be carried out according to a limited, clearly outlined plan—it can be "organized." The unlimited cannot be attained by organ-

ization. That which is distant can be reached only through that which is nearest at the moment. Any "plan" is wrong to begin with—simply because it is a plan. The highest things cannot be planned; for them readiness is really everything. Readiness is the only thing we can offer to the Jewish individual within us, the individual we aim at. Only the first gentle push of the will—and "will" is almost too strong a word—that first quite gentle push we give ourselves when in the confusion of the world we once quietly say, "we Jews," and by that expression commit ourselves for the first time to the eternal pledge which, according to an old saying, makes every Jew responsible for every other Jew. Nothing more is assumed than the simple resolve to say once: "Nothing Jewish is alien to me"—and this itself is hardly a resolve but almost nothing more than a small impulse to look around oneself and into oneself. What each will see then no one can venture to predict.

I will dare to predict only this much: that each will see the whole. For just as it is impossible to attain to the whole without modestly beginning with that which is nearest, so is it impossible for a person not to attain to the whole, the whole destined for him, if he has really found the strength to make that first simple and most modest beginning. It is necessary for him to free himself from those stupid claims which would impose Juda-"ism" on him as a canon of definite, circumscribed "Jewish duties" (vulgar orthodoxy), or "Jewish tasks" (vulgar Zionism), or—God forbid—"Jewish ideas" (vulgar liberalism). If he has prepared himself quite simply to have everything that happens to him, inwardly and outwardly, happen to him in a *Jewish way*—his vocation, his nationality, his marriage and even, if that has to be, his Juda-"ism"—then he may be certain that with the simple assumption of that infinite "pledge" he will become in reality "wholly Jewish."

And there is indeed no other way to become completely Jewish; in no other way does the Jewish human being arise. All recipes, whether Zionist, orthodox or liberal, produce caricatures of men, which become more ridiculous the more closely the recipes are followed. And a caricature of a man is also a caricature of a Jew; for, as a

Jew, one cannot separate one from the other. There is only one recipe that can make a person Jewish and hence—just because he is a Jew and destined to a Jewish life—a full human being; that recipe is to have no recipe, which is what I have just tried to show in what I feel are very inadequate terms. Our fathers had a beautiful word for it that says everything: trust (*Trauen*).

Trust is the word for a state of readiness that does not ask for recipes, and does not mouth perpetually "What shall I do then?" and "How can I do that?" Trust is not afraid of the day after tomorrow. It lives in the present, it recklessly crosses the threshold leading from today into tomorrow. Trust knows only that which is nearest and therefore it possesses the whole. Trust walks straight ahead. And yet, for those who trust, the street that loses itself in infinity for the fearful rounds itself imperceptibly into a measurable and yet infinite circle.

Thus the Jewish individual needs nothing but readiness. Those who would help him can give him nothing but the empty forms of preparedness, which he himself and only he himself may fill. Who gives him more gives him less. Only the empty vessels in which something can happen may be kept in readiness—"time" and "space." Really nothing more than that is needed—time to speak in and space to speak in. This is all that can be "organized" in advance, which is very little—the next thing to nothing.

Our new Jewish periodicals, which in recent years have taken on more and more of the character of lecture halls, have sensed this need very subtly. Thus they, and especially Buber's *Der Jude* which is the best among them, have become real forces in our life, and perhaps the most vital at that. The "movement for public Jewish institutions of higher studies"—a bad designation because it suggests an incorrect parallel with the German movement for higher public education, which has quite different aims—is the latest and perhaps most important movement in present-day German Jewry. But it must make clear to itself what it intends to do. Exploiting the big-city public's insatiable hunger for lectures, it can fill the enormous gaps in Jewish education by supplying what "religious" instruction neglected and what

the universities failed to offer. It would probably have to offer a complete as possible series of courses, a curriculum as encyclopedic as possible—in other words, an education. Given things as they are, however, and despite the best of intentions—which this movement, in contrast to our degenerated system of religious instruction, certainly has—it would become merely a substitute in the end for something that should normally be offered elsewhere but cannot because the living force, a center and germ-cell of a Jewish life for Jewish individuals, is wanting. In such a life only could the endless book-world of education find its vital beginning and end.

But the movement in question might try to become this very center of a Jewish life. It may try to become the form for such a life, but certainly only the first, empty, immediate form. It would try to be a beginning. Instead of confronting the seeker of knowledge with a planned whole, to be entered step by step, it would keep itself a mere modest beginning, a mere opportunity to make a beginning. At a university the student is faced with the edifice of a science that is complete in general outline and needs only development in detail; it lies outside the student and he is to enter it and make himself at home in it. This movement, however, would begin with its own bare beginnings, which would be simply a space to speak in and time in which to speak.

Nothing more? Yes, nothing more. Let one have "trust," for once. Renounce all plans. Wait. People will appear who by the very fact that they come to the conference room of a public Jewish institution of higher learning (will someone suggest a better word?) prove that the Jewish human being is alive in them. For otherwise they would not come. To begin with, don't offer them anything. Listen. And words will come to the listener, and they will join together and form desires. And desires are the messengers of trust. Desires that join and men that join together: Jews—and an attempt is made to supply them with what they ask for. This too will be done modestly. For who knows whether desires such as these—real, spontaneous desires, not artificially nurtured by some scheme of education—can be satisfied? But those who know how to listen to real

wishes may perhaps also know how to point out the desired way. This will be the hardest task of all. For the teacher able to satisfy such spontaneous desires cannot be a teacher according to a plan; he must be much more and much less, a master and at the same time a pupil. It will not be enough that he himself knows or that he himself can teach. He must be capable of something quite different—he himself must be able to “desire.” He who can desire must be the teacher here. The teachers will be discovered in the same discussion room and the same discussion period as the students. And in the same discussion hour the same person may be heard as both master and student. In fact it is only when this happens that it will become certain that a person is qualified to teach.

It is essential that the discussion place be a single room—without a waiting room. The discussion must be “public.” Those who come can wait in the discussion room itself. They can wait until the moment comes for them to join in. The discussion should become a conversation. Anyone who wants to continue the conversation with a single person can make an appointment for afterwards. The discussion period should bring everybody together. For it brings them to each other on the basis of that which they all have in common—the consciousness, no matter how rudimentary, no matter how concealed, of being a Jewish human being. That one can meet others on such a basis, that one can desire in common with others—this will be an experience, even should the desire remain unsatisfied. Which should be allowed for. Just as sometimes a lecture may not be given for lack of an audience, so a desire may go unsatisfied for lack of a teacher. This does not matter. For while a lecture that is only announced and never given remains still-born because it remains the intention of only a single person, a common wish that goes unsatisfied stays alive because it unites many.

That the discussion period is open to the public assures us of this. For this public quality is very unpropitious to the mortal adversary who dogs the steps of our German Jewry—especially, let it be said, its non-Zionist section—the “stuffed shirt.” All the “stuffed shirts” and those who aspire to become “stuffed shirts,” all those young and

old cases of senility, will simply not dare to enter the discussion room. For questions are asked here, while they want proclamations. Doubts are entertained here, while they want programs. Desires are expressed here, while they want demands. It is as unlikely that “stuffed shirts” will stray among these students—unless they see the light and shed their starched shirt-fronts—as it is that lecture-platform lions will be heard among their teachers. There has been enough of speech-making. The speaker’s platform has been perverted into a false pulpit long enough among us—just punishment for a rabbinate that in its majority has been able at best to convert the pulpit into a bad speaker’s platform. The voices of those who want these desirous students to desire them as teachers must lose the “true ring” of dead-sure conviction. For those who haven’t had more than enough of this ring will hardly find their way to us.

But who else will? I can already hear voices saying: “How vague, how undefined, how cloudy.” Let those who talk this way remain in the realm of the certain, the definite, in the bright light of the common-placeness in which they feel so comfortable. For it will be of little use to add to the sobriety they already possess an equally sober and ordinary “Judaism”—which is all they will get if they ask this way.

I can also hear voices of those who say: “How little.” Let those who talk this way remain undisturbed among the “much” they possess. For it will be of little use to add to their collection of so many various things another little knick-knack labelled “my Jewishness”—which is all they will get if they ask this way.

But perhaps here and there somebody will say longingly, “How beautiful,” and think hesitantly, “If such a thing only existed—” I grant the doubts of such as *these*. Let them doubt, but let them come. Let them find out whether “such a thing exists.” It depends on them and only on them whether it does exist. It depends on their power to wish, their urge to question, their courage to doubt. Among *them* are the students and the masters. Let them come. If they do not come, then the old Preacher of Ecclesiastes is right for our generation too: of making many books there is no end.

FROM THE AMERICAN SCENE

PORTRAIT OF A CHAPLAIN

MEYER LEVIN

ON AUGUST 11, 1944, on a road somewhere near Vire, France, a fragmentation bomb dropped from a German plane exploded beside Chaplain Rabbi Irving Tepper of the 60th Infantry Regiment. Twenty-two pieces of shrapnel went into him. For nearly two days Irving Tepper fought to live; the doctors who tended him declare they never saw a man so badly wounded fight so hard. But he died in a field hospital and was buried in an Army cemetery near Chasney.

Chaplain Tepper's army record is simple. He trained at Fort Bragg, and was assigned to the 2nd Battalion of the 60th Infantry. With this dirt-soldier outfit he made the first landing in Africa, with them he went through every African battle, including the bloody fight for Sedjanene valley, which won the battalion a presidential citation; with them he went through the Sicily campaign, and the time of waiting in England; with them he landed in France, and he remained in action with his regiment until he was killed.

THIS department, which will appear every month, will be devoted to reportage of persons, institutions, places and events in the American scene. MEYER LEVIN, our first contributor, is best known for his novel *The Old Bunch*. Formerly an editor and motion picture critic for *Esquire*, he has written for Hollywood and been on the staff of OWI, where he headed a documentary film crew. He has just returned from Europe, where he was war correspondent for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and the Overseas News Agency. Levin was the first correspondent to enter a German horror camp and did invaluable service in compiling lists of the survivors in the camps at Dachau and Buchenwald before official Jewish representatives could reach the scene.

I knew many rabbi chaplains in France and Germany; usually they were assigned to a large body of troops such as a corps, since they could, from this level, reach Jewish soldiers in several divisions and in scattered special units. There were also a number of rabbi chaplains at division level, but only a very few lived down on the level of the fighting soldier.

I never knew Irving Tepper while he lived, but I feel that I know him now, through the men of his regiment. He was young, the boys say about thirty. He was one of those stringy little guys whose head came up to everyone else's chin; he was one of those book-readers with more stamina than a backwoodsman. Tepper came from Chicago's West Side, from among the sons of fur workers and cigar makers and garment workers, from the solid Jewish blocks where the public schools close on Jewish holidays.

He was trained at the Hebrew Theological College, which is on Douglas Boulevard, across the street from the Jewish People's Institute; he probably went to basketball games, dances, anti-fascist meetings and Irish and Russian plays at the J.P.I.

The Hebrew Theological College is of course orthodox, turning out rabbis who eat kosher and wear skullcaps, rather than modern pastors who introduce Sunday lectures by Erika Mann in their temples. What makes a Chicago kid tie himself in the "fetishes" of orthodoxy? Is he sincere? Does he really believe in *tefillim*? This is no boy from Warsaw, continuing long habits, but a young man who reads Tillie the Toiler and *The Nation*, a fellow who cracks wise, makes puns, and knows the pitch.

To go orthodox, he must be a fellow who believes in the head-on attack. If the defini-

tion of a Jew to the McSweeneys and the Pisanis is a Jew won't eat pork, then he says there is no use confusing the issue by claiming that's just the old folks from the old country, we American-born eat ham fried in butter same as you. The head-on attack is to adopt the old symbols and say a Jew is a Jew and he doesn't take his hat off in church, and try to reach an understanding, from there out.

I guess that is how Tepper felt.

There was one other curious thing about this West Side rabbi. Tepper did not have a synagogue. Chaplain Judah Nadich, in Paris, told me that Tepper was identified with organization work in Hapoel Hamizrachi. Which is to say that he was working in the left wing of the right wing of Jewish life.

WHEN I went to look into the memory of Tepper among the boys in his battalion, they were fighting in the Siegfried line, around the town of Rötgen. Their battalion had been the first to enter Germany.

This would have meant a great deal to Tepper, for the boys recalled how his greatest war ambition was to conduct services on German soil. In a way, they carried this out for him, since the first Jewish service in Germany was a memorial service for Chaplain Irving Tepper, held by fifteen of the oldtimers of the battalion. It was held on Rosh Hashanah in the back part of a textile factory; there was still a picture of Hitler on the wall, but the linty atmosphere from the goods the Germans had left on the machines smelled homelike to the GI sons of garment workers.

Just after the *kaddish* for Tepper, Chaplain Sidney Lefkowitz started the New Year's service, and while a soldier cantor was singing, enemy planes came over. The cantor ducked under a table, and continued to sing, and this reminded the boys of the time Irving Tepper held a Sabbath service in Beaumont Hague, France, and the bombs began to fall, and the whole congregation crowded under the table with the rabbi to finish their prayers. So it was a commemoration in Tepper's own way.

When I came around asking about Tepper, there were not many oldtimers left in his outfit; the battalion consisted largely of re-

placements. They replaced the dead whom Tepper himself had buried, and the wounded, and the few who had been sent home. The best place to find people who knew the chaplain, the boys said, would be among the medics and aidmen, because the chaplain worked where the wounded were brought in. They said Dr. Soslowsky, at the clearing station, could tell me about Tepper.

A clearing station is a group of large tents where wounded receive emergency treatment and classification on their way to field hospitals. In Africa, in Sicily, or in Germany, all clearing stations look the same, and Tepper must have been in and out of these very tents a dozen times a day.

Dr. Hyman Soslowsky of Brooklyn was a man of ponderous speech. We sat on some medical supply boxes while he tried to convey what he felt about Tepper.

"He was a man of brilliant understanding of people," Soslowsky said. "He was a man with a real quick tongue, and before anybody could say anything, he had the comeback. You know, Tepper always ate kosher, even in the army. So he was the first one to make cracks about it, always joking about all his kosher troubles, and when he made the jokes himself, everybody had to respect him for his principles. You see?"

But he shook his head, as if that wasn't the main quality, the deep thing he wanted to bring out. "To the boys, Tepper was somebody that would talk up for them, right up to the generals. He would kid with the officers, but he would get everything for the boys. He had his nerve and he would kid even a general, to get what he wanted for the boys. In Africa, when nothing was coming through, he was the first one to get the men their cigarette rations and chocolate, and he even got them to bring in a library. He also put it through with General Eddy that the Jewish boys should be taken out of line for their holiday services." Dr. Soslowsky meditated again. "But the main thing is, he was always doing things he didn't have to do."

"Like the censoring," said a corporal, Rudy Walzer, who was sitting on a pile of blankets. "If a fellow didn't want the regular censor to go over his mail, you know, something real personal, he'd take it to Tepper. One time there, the chaplain was censoring half the battalion mail."

"Even when he was killed," Dr. Soslowsky pointed out, "Tepper was some place he wasn't supposed to be. He went into a house to shag out a couple of boys because the bombing was getting too close, and that was how he got hit."

At the moment the clearing station was not busy. Captain H. B. Copelman of New Brunswick, a surgeon who had just been recaptured from the Germans, came over to talk about Tepper. Copelman leaned on the operating table—a litter across a few uprights—the sort of table upon which Tepper must have lain during his last hours. "All the time we'd be traveling," Copelman said, "he'd be writing V-mails to the boys' folks, just keeping in contact, making those folks feel somebody had an eye on their boy." But Copelman, too, seemed to feel it was difficult to bring out the essential, inner thing about the chaplain. "He wasn't a narrow man," he said. "You understand?"

"In Sicily," Soslowsky said, "he had a couple of Catholic priests for friends. They lunched together every day. You know, he was the chaplain for the battalion, not just for the Jewish boys. So he was interested in all the religions."

"He read a lot," Corporal Walzer said. "He was a great one for gadgets. He'd get an old jeep battery and fix himself up a light so he could read in his tent."

"Talk to some of the aid men," Copelman suggested. "Tepper was always up front where they are."

An ambulance was going to a collection point—a large tent in the field. There, a major who didn't want his name mentioned because his mother still thought he was working in a base hospital, started telling about the chaplain. "He was always with the men. What they carried, he carried. If they had one blanket, that's all he'd take, to sleep in. He'd refuse a ride, to march with the boys. And after the longest hike he'd come up with that grin of his. You know," the major said, "he was a puzzle to me in his way: he didn't drink or play cards, and he'd come around when the boys were shooting craps and kid the bejeezus out of them, but you had to say he was one of the boys. Nobody ever felt embarrassed with him around, you know, like with some kind of angelic characters. He was nervy, half the time you couldn't make

him wear his helmet. In Port Lyautey when he was holding a burial service the Heinies were sniping from the next hill but that never bothered him, he only wore his skullcap and said they were poor marksmen anyway. You know, he built that first cemetery in Africa, Port Lyautey, he practically had to blast it out of the rocks. It's a beautiful place. All the boys remember the job he did there, because that was our first dead, and the way he took care of them made the boys feel better."

Just then, a litter-bearing jeep drove up, and a couple of aidmen carried in a sergeant whose arm had been torn by a booby trap explosion. A young chaplain followed the aidmen into the tent. He was helping the wounded sergeant joke about his arm, the way Tepper must have done. After fixing the man up for cigarettes the chaplain came over to talk about Tepper. His name was W. J. MacLeod, he was from Everett, Mass., and he had been Tepper's room-mate in Winchester, England, while they were waiting for D-Day.

SITTING on the tail-end of the jeep, driving to the aid post among the foxholes in the woods, MacLeod said, "You know, Tepper carried along more books than any of us. He was a heavy reader in philosophy and psychology. His ideas were broad—nothing sectarian, though he was orthodox. He didn't believe in any single solution of the Jewish question, Zionist or socialist; he believed we could make some progress by getting people to know and understand each other. I don't think he was ambitious in a career sense. Sometimes he would say he thought of staying in the army, after the war, because he liked to make things a little easier for the boys. Naturally, he hated war—"

A couple of large mobile guns nearby were sounding off, and MacLeod waited for them to cease firing. Then he told about a wonderful joke Tepper had pulled off, at a great, happy Purim service he had organized in Winchester. Tepper had primed MacLeod on the Purim service, taught him to sing "Adon Olum," and then seated him next to the local rabbi, passing the preacher off as a good Jewish soldier from the Bronx. MacLeod had fooled everybody at the table, especially with his rendition of "Adon

Olum," and everybody including the local rabbi had laughed themselves hoarse when Tepper unmasked his goyish friend.

An aidman came back to the jeep with us. He was a big unshaven boy, with a round face and heavy lips, the kind of fellow who would look exactly at home eating a hot pastrami sandwich in Gold's delicatessen. His name was Alvin Kass, and he was from Albany, New York. When he talked about Tepper, he had a hard time keeping his voice from jumping.

"The fellows used to call him the little Jew chaplain," Alvin said. "I used to drive him in my ambulance, but the only times he'd ride was if I was carrying wounded and he was sitting with them. In that seven-day forced march we had to Oran, a hundred miles, he wouldn't take a ride, he kept hiking with the fellows, and you know when they'd see him hiking along with his small fast choppy steps and his grin from ear to ear, it made them feel better. I remember the last day one of the captains was trying to speed up the men, and the chaplain kept kidding the captain about his whip, because every time there was a ten-minute halt the captain would want to break it up quicker, and the chaplain would look at his watch and say, 'Got your whip out yet, captain?'"

John Lynch, a jeep-driver from Boston, said, "Remember the twenty days of Maknassy, in March, 1942. That was one of our biggest battles. The chaplain had to get the dead bodies off the field. That was one of the chaplain's jobs, in this outfit—they made an undertaker out of him. He would have to get those bodies and load them on mules and carry them four miles over the hills with the Krauts potting at him all the time."

"He even had to scrounge a burying detail," Alvin Kass said. "I've seen him go right up the line in daytime under enemy observation to get a man's body, and he'd come back always easy and cheerful, you'd think he was coming from the rear echelon instead of the front lines."

Lynch said, "He'd bring those bodies over the hill and sometimes dig the grave himself, when he couldn't get a burying detail. Then the first chance he'd get he'd dig up those bodies and load them on a jeep and bring them back fifteen miles to the regular cemetery. He wouldn't leave anybody out there."

In a large farmhouse back on the road was the command post of the 2nd Battalion. In the upstairs bedrooms a number of aidmen had fixed themselves some comfortable lodgings for a change. They had real beds, and a table, and even a toilet that worked.

Morris Olander of Armstrong, New York, was there. He had been Tepper's assistant. Jake Pianelli of New Jersey and Clifford Parks of New Rochelle were also oldtimers in the outfit, and the three of them sat around the table, talking about Tepper.

"Remember the time on the hill in Maknassy," Parks said, "when they had us pinned down with artillery fire, and Tepper was sitting there on the hill directing those shells where to fall?"

"I like to bust," Pianelli said. "They sure had us zeroed in, and there he sits, here comes one, he says, fall to the left, and here comes the next one, fall to the right!"

"Remember when you were teaching him Italian?" Olander said to Pianelli.

"That was hot," Pianelli admitted. "He was always learning languages, the chaplain, so when we got to Sicily he said how about teaching me some Italian. So we started in. Only after two weeks, he was teaching me!"

"He was broadminded," said Parks. "He'd watch the fellows shooting craps."

"Remember the time he prayed for Al Eisen to lose?" Olander said.

Pianelli burst out laughing at the memory. "So Eisen got cleaned," he explained, "and what does he do, he turns around and borrows the dough from the chaplain to stay in the game."

"He had a tough job," Olander said. "When we were in Africa, he didn't even have a jeep. Many a time I've seen him standing alongside the road with his field desk and his hymnal and his prayer-case, hitching rides."

The boys thought there might be a few more oldtimers up the line, in a trench on the hill, so we started up that way. Olander talked of how Tepper had always sought out the Jewish communities, in Oran and Cefalu and all the African towns, arranging for the boys to get acquainted with Jewish families, everywhere. And at dances, he remembered how Tepper used to shag the bashful lads toward the girls. "The girls were always crazy about the chaplain, but I

guess he wasn't romantic or something. He used to bring them over to the fellows."

Two-thirds of the way up the hill was a captured pillbox. Staff Sergeant Grover Younce was squatting on the concrete floor, polishing a Luger he had taken off a jerry. "Yah, I remember the chaplain. Remember the time he got the Christmas cards printed for us, in Palermo." Another oldtimer, Staff Sergeant Isadore Lewis, recalled how the chaplain had put one over on the brass. "The time in Algiers, when he wanted to go sight-seeing and he didn't have a jeep. He told them he had to go look for a native synagogue, so they assigned him a jeep. Boy, he sure made the rounds, he sure looked in some mighty queer places for synagogues!"

"The chaplain knew his way around," Sergeant Younce said, winking.

"Remember the lecture he gave on sex?" That was a famous performance, the regular army sex lecture—and how the rabbi had kidded them about Army and Navy techniques.

The sex lecture was also the big memory of the men farther up the hill, in a long trench damp after a week of rain. But the sun was out today, and hot chow had just been lugged up to them. Junior Fortner of Galax, Virginia, back from a rifle-hole stretch in a hospital, said, "The chaplain really put on some act with that sex talk. By the time he was through you'd be ashamed to stand in any line, even a chow line! He sure could talk." And, reflectively, "I remember the talk he gave us first time before we went into action."

"He could always break it up with a joke," Olander said. "I remember even in the middle of a service, he'd look at the fellows and interrupt himself and say, 'Well, here's George Grossman wants to go home, but George, the big picture hasn't got it in it yet for you to go home'—and then he'd go right on with the service."

Sergeant Kurt Roszat of Port Chester, another oldtimer back in the lines after being wounded and hospitalized, said, "First we didn't like the idea of having a chaplain with us, we'd swear like hell figuring maybe that would make him take off, but he'd yell out, 'Will you — bums stop that — swearing all the — time,' and you'd laugh, but

before you knew it you'd be saying rump."

There was a spurt of gunfire from behind a house on the crest of the hill. "That — kraut!" Roszat swore. "Come chow time, he lets off a few just to annoy us!"

"I'll never forget the day we were going in column formation through those woods in Sicily," said Pat Hoey of Belleville, New Jersey. "That German patrol started cutting into us and the boys started dropping. Tepper kept right on talking, telling stories."

"He was offered a chaplain job on corps level," Olander said, "and he turned it down because he wanted to stay at the front with the boys."

Pat Hoey recalled another incident that made him laugh. "The time at Cefalu," he said, "when we got that five-gallon tin and filled it full of vermouth, and along comes inspection. The chaplain stuck the tin under his cot for us, but they found it anyway. So what does he do, he says it's sacramental wine!"

"I remember now," Olander said, looking out over the hills into Germany, "I remember one time when I think he had the most guts of all. That was right after we landed in Port Lyautey, when we lost all those seventy-six men in landing, our first dead, seventy-six men, that was pretty rough, and we were having a memorial service for them on the shore. We didn't have any bugle there to blow taps. And nobody could figure out how to do it. Then Chaplain Tepper said all right, he would sing the taps, and he got up there in front of the whole crowd, the whole thousand men. That took nerve. You know he was a little guy, the chaplain, and his voice cracked. But there was not a smile in the crowd, and he went right through with it to the end. That's how I remember the chaplain," Olander concluded, "standing up there and singing the taps, because it was something the boys had to have."

Sergeant Milton Westfal, of Rochester, said, "I never knew Tepper was a Jewish chaplain for a long time. He was just the chaplain."

"Yah," the boys agreed. A silence fell. That's how they were remembering the chaplain—Pat Hoey, and Pianelli, and Kurt Roszat, and Manford Whitaker, remembering the little Jew chaplain, Irving Tepper.

THE STUDY OF MAN

SOcial scientists can no longer be reproached for busying themselves with theoretical issues while ignoring the major problems confronting mankind. The ivory towers now stand abandoned; almost every scholar of note in the fields of sociology, psychology and anthropology concerns himself with how the studies devoted to the extension of man's knowledge of man may advance solutions to the problems of a free society. The theoretical equipment developed in the study of the social life of Melanesians or the learning habits of rats is now turned on Western man. At the same time new theoretical approaches are being developed and applied, designed specifically for the special problems of our own society.

Those engaged in the various fields would freely concede that results to date are not world-shaking. What was suspected and what common sense asserted has in some cases been proved; some concepts have been more exactly

It is the purpose of this department to rove the various fields of the social sciences with a view to reporting to the thoughtful general reader what contributions the research, discussion, thought and speculation of social scientists are making to the solution of problems of general concern. As the department is planned, the branches of the social sciences will be divided into three groupings. The first will include anthropology, sociology and social psychology, and will be covered by NATHAN GLAZER of the staff of COMMENTARY. The second, philosophy, ethics and education, will be treated by Professor SIDNEY HOOK of New York University. The third, including economics and political science, will be covered by BEN B. SELIGMAN, who has written widely in these fields. Nathan Glazer, who writes the department this month, is a journalist and student of the social sciences who has been trying to combine both roles by interpreting advances in the social sciences for the generally informed reader. During 1941-43 he edited *Avukah Student Action*, journal of the student Zionist Federation. Following this he did research in and taught Oriental and African languages (Swahili, Moroccan Arabic, Bengali) at the University of Pennsylvania.

defined and others have been shown to be invalid; what we knew generally has been made more explicit. Yet while the results are relatively meager, the promise is tremendous. Admitted that the study of man is some centuries behind the study of nature, yet it can no longer be denied that it is a science.

In this department, we will cover journals, monographs and other publications. We shall consider reports of original research and reports of discussions and conferences—whenever these point to an understanding of the major social problems facing our times. Some of the material treated will deal with problems directly affecting the Jewish group and its relations to society. Much will not have such special reference, but will be no less relevant to our problems: first, because, obviously, whatever affects mankind affects us; second, because no group has more at stake, has more reason to study and understand the changing trends and counter-trends of contemporary ideas. As a group, we seem to be particularly exposed to the social climate of our times, its changing winds and weather.

HOW FAR the academic ivory tower has been left behind by the social sciences this first monthly section of "The Study of Man" can serve to illustrate. In past months the social sciences have, among other problems, been dealing with proposals for the treatment of Germany, methods of training teachers for inter-cultural education and with problems of inter-group prejudices. In every case the proposals and their analysis stem directly from theoretical work in the past ten years.

During the summer of 1944, a series of meetings attended by a distinguished group of psychiatrists, psychologists and social scientists was held to consider what was to be done with Germany after the war. In the February *Psychiatry*, Prof. Talcott Parsons of Harvard presents the report he prepared for the Conference on "The Problem of Planned Institutional Change" (the full report including Professor Parsons' paper is in the July *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*). This paper includes the consensus of the Conference, as well as some proposals for the treatment of

Germany, but it is besides this "a contribution to the theory of controlled institutional change"—which in more popular terminology is "social engineering" or "planning."

"The principal emphasis of the conference was on the existence of a typical German character-structure which predisposes people to define all human relations in terms of dominance, submission and romantic revolt... (and which is) interdependent with an institutional structure of German society..." The Conference asserts that almost any German, regardless of differences of sex, class, age and region, has a distinctive group of character traits as a German; and it is this, rather than "the particular recent situation in which the German nation has been placed, or... the character and policies of a particular political regime," which is the primary source of German "aggressive expansionism."

It is German character-structure, consequently, that must be changed, but it does not follow that it can be changed by a direct approach; since it is interdependent with the institutional structure of German society, the way to changing German character lies through changing German institutions.

This distinctive German character-structure has two components: "an emotional, idealistic, active, romantic" and "an orderly, hard-working, hierarchy-preoccupied, methodical, submissive, gregarious, materialistic." The first, arising from certain features of child-rearing in Germany—they are left unspecified—and from tensions of living in German society, has generally had an apolitical outlet, through "cultural expression"; but the Nazis linked it closely to the second component: "The first task... is to disrupt this synthesis and create a situation in which the romantic element will again find an apolitical form of expression." The second component is the more dangerous; it involves emphasis on *status*, rank in a hierarchy—whether it be party, military, state, industrial or family—rather than *function*. It is unclear as to how this type of character-structure—assuming the analysis to be true—can be shown to lead to the political behavior of modern Germany without taking into account other factors, but the implication of the conference report is that it does.

This is the diagnosis. And the cure is changing a society. This is where Prof. Parsons' contribution to the theory of planned institutional change fits in. To Prof. Parsons, changing a society means changing its institutions—that is, changing the behavior expected of people in their roles as parents, workers, citizens and so forth. This behavior is evoked by a particular social situation combined with the individual's

own motivations. Since the social situation demanding a certain behavior of the individual is formed for the most part by the motivations of individuals like oneself, the two factors support each other, giving institutions their well-known stability and leading to the fact that what we "want" to do is generally what we "should" do.

Prof. Parsons examines in some detail the "vested interest" reaction which is the main bulwark of a threatened *status quo*. "To attempt to deprive a person or a group of something in which they enjoy a vested interest... involves not only the frustrations dependent on deprivation... but also... outrages the moral sentiments surrounding the claim to legitimacy. The resistance of the peoples or groups affected is thus strengthened by their sense of injustice. Furthermore, the same fact enables them to rally support for their claims from people who do not share the same interests... finally... among those who oppose a vested interest group there is likely to be an element of guilt arising from the fact that they share the same value patterns." Frustrated administrators—and revolutionists—would do well to study this little outline of the perils awaiting those who attempt structural changes in society.

But this is the less hopeful side of the situation. Prof. Parsons also points out that "every at all complex society contains very important elements of internal conflict and tension... [this] almost certainly means that there are allies within the social system itself which can be enlisted on the side of change."

Change itself can be effected in two ways, theoretically: by changing the objective situation or by changing the motivations of people, their subjective attitudes. Proposals to destroy the heavy industry of Germany, for example, are in the first category; plans for "democratic re-education" are in the second.

Prof. Parsons himself is wary of the subjective approach: "The view so common among Americans that it is 'conversion' to democratic values which is the key to bringing Germany 'around' is one of the most dangerous misconceptions currently in the air. To attempt to do so by propaganda or another means of indoctrination would almost certainly intensify a tendency toward ideological reaction..." This warning is supported by one of the best-founded conclusions of social science: that the "reasonableness" of propaganda or education is irrelevant to its acceptance or rejection. If the beliefs one is trying to inculcate do not fill social and individual needs, then they will be rejected.

Concerning the situational approach, Parsons asserts that of the four key institutions which have been discussed as possible carriers

of social change in Germany—the family, the formal educational system, the state and the economic-occupational structure—the last is the most promising. It is here that the crucial change from “status” to “function” can be introduced with the least resistance, and has the greatest reverberations throughout the social structure. For example, we cannot modify the domineering role of the father in the German family directly, but by reducing the tension he feels about the status connected with his job, we reduce his need to be dominant at home. Parsons envisages this change as necessitating an increase in the number of “functional roles” (jobs) in German industry and an actual increase in Germany’s war-making power: “The essential thing is that there should be a policy of fostering a highly productive, full-employment, expanding economy for Germany.” When it is still by no means certain that America itself will have such an economy, it will seem utopian to many to think that such a policy is within the realm of possibility for Germany.

The Conference makes use of one of the most important concepts developed in the social sciences—that which Erich Fromm calls “character-structure” and Abram Kardiner, “basic personality.” Fromm means by his term the characteristics of individuals formed under similar conditions of development and living, and uses it to explain the political behavior of the German middle class. He emphasizes character differences between *classes*, but assuming similar conditions for all classes in a nation, there appears to be no reason why a national character-structure transcending class should not develop. Kardiner’s concept of “basic personality” grew out of the analysis of the “primitive” societies studied by anthropologists. By analyzing institutions and beliefs he discovered the type of personality that was shared to some extent by all members of a society, and later isolated specific factors in infancy and childhood—for example, the way discipline was enforced—that played a predominant role in forming this group personality.

Kardiner’s work makes possible a thoroughly scientific validation of the view that a specific character-structure is at the root of German political activity. But the fact is, that today we have very little of the information necessary to find out whether there is a German character-structure, and what it is. We know more about the character-structure of the people of Alor in the Dutch East Indies than about that of the Germans.

Consequently, the description of German character-structure given by the Conference must be highly speculative. It appears to con-

form—in specialized terminology—to the popular view of the German as hard, domineering, formal, methodical, and at the same time mystical and romantic. The emphasis on “status” as against “function” would seem to hold true for all Western society; in which case how could it be used to explain the specifically German? It seems premature as yet to ascribe the German explosion to a German character. This criticism, however, would not invalidate Prof. Parsons’ analysis of how social changes can be planned, since it would hold no matter what character-structure or character-structures existed in Germany.

“WORKSHOPS in intergroup education,” i.e., institutes training teachers to teach tolerance, have been conducted since the summer of 1941 by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Bureau for Intercultural Education. Fourteen workshops were scheduled for last summer (no more than two in one summer had been held previously). The *May Journal of Educational Sociology* is devoted entirely to the description and evaluation of workshops of previous years and the plans for those held this summer.

Dr. Hilda Taba, who has been most active in training teachers in intercultural education, describes the workshop she conducted at Harvard in 1944. Twenty-six teachers attended, representing a wide range of ethnic groups, different sections of the country and different levels of tolerance and ability. Each participant came with a practical project to be worked out at the workshop and applied in the coming school year. In addition to help with the individual projects, the workshop leaders tried to increase the participants’ general knowledge of the nature of group prejudice and to teach the use of the various educational tools applied in this field (these are mainly “units on contributions of various culture groups”).

Dr. Taba’s workshop—most of those being held this summer are modelled on it—emphasizes a practical project. A different type of workshop, putting a greater emphasis on “theory,” is that planned for the University of Chicago and described by Allison Davis and Robert Havighurst. “Theory” means the new science that is emerging from psychology, sociology and anthropology (called “Human Development” at Chicago and “Human Relations” at Yale). Three basic concepts of the science are emphasized at the Chicago workshop: heredity (limitations of race for the explanation of group differences); social structure (“as a system of relationships and statuses which largely determine both social behavior and emotional patterns”); and cultural learning (“cul-

ture as a learned way of life, a basic system of social habits and values"). Participants further learn to use tests which enable one to measure how much each group likes or dislikes the others and to discover the stereotypes each group has of itself and others. "Finally, this approach implies new methods of teaching. Discussion and the socialized interview must be developed..." The new methods are not further specified.

Teachers coming out of this workshop should be adept in discovering to what extent little Irish children hate little Jewish children, and why, in the nature of things (this being given by the three basic concepts, which tell us that each niche in the system of castes, classes and ethnic groups into which we are born implies the hatred, distrust, respect or fear of other castes, classes and ethnic groups) this must be so, but will be stumped by the problem of what to do about it; while teachers coming out of Dr. Taba's workshop should skilfully run plays, projects, etc., in which all the little Czech, Italian, Greek and Jewish children supply bits of half-remembered Old World ethnic cultures to make up a rather unreal picture of "America." Neither one, nor a combination of the two, seems to promise a perceptible reduction of group hatreds.

AN UNINTENTIONED critique of this program of intercultural education is to be found in the first issue of the new *Journal of Social Issues*, one of two on "Racial and Religious Prejudice in Everyday Living" edited by Gene Weltfish (Columbia University anthropologist who was co-author of *The Races of Mankind* pamphlet). The issue contains an article on "The Causes of Group Antagonisms" (a synthesis of twelve contributions by prominent psychologists and anthropologists), four fictional sketches illustrating prejudice with appended "what can be done" notes by experts, and a concluding section—like the first a group product—on what facts are still to be investigated and what type of action will work.

"The Causes of Group Antagonisms" summarizes what by now is well-known: that "every tribe, state and nation has its own style of group antagonisms" (and consequently explanations of prejudice in terms of a "natural" distrust of the foreigner or the minority are untrue); that prejudice against a group is hardly affected by experience, pleasant or unpleasant, with individual members of that group; that the force behind group hatred is

supplied by individual frustration, and that in America this frustration is most likely due to failure to achieve the success and security held out to all by the "American Dream."

The conclusion for Jews seems to be that the only way to reduce anti-Semitism is either to change the "American style" of group antagonisms, in which the Jew now holds the number-two position, or to reduce the frustrations that support group antagonisms.

The contributors to the *Journal* are consequently not overly hopeful of the possibilities of intercultural education that does neither of these: "...many educational attempts which seem to make a contribution in this direction [reducing group antagonisms] have no effect when measured against these criteria [changing behavior]. Certain types of emotional appeal fade quickly in their effect; logical intellectual approaches frequently fail to have any influence on behavior or attitude..."

The scientists suggest that "we need more facts about the pattern of prejudice and discrimination in different cultures to aid us in getting perspective on educational possibilities in working with 'human nature' in our own culture." Differences in the "pattern of prejudice" are of some importance; group antagonisms are by no means everywhere the same. Ruth Benedict points out that in Europe, majorities have tried forcibly to assimilate minorities by interdicting the practice of the minority language and culture. In America, on the other hand, minorities want to be completely indistinguishable from the majority. Solutions of minority problems are consequently quite different in Europe and America.

Dr. Benedict also points out that the "scapegoat syndrome" (relieving frustration by aggression against a scapegoat) is not found in Japan. Whether or not this is so, the suggestion that we study societies in which our forms of prejudice do not exist to get ideas on how to attack them certainly seems valuable.

The conclusion of this group of scientists is that "many individuals must go through what amounts to a therapeutic experience rather than the more typical conception of an educational procedure before... prejudices can be yielded up for new constructive sources of satisfaction." But can we find anything more satisfying than prejudice as an outlet for frustration? If not, must not the attack be on the frustration rather than the form of its expression?

NATHAN GLAZER

BOOKS IN REVIEW

These Are Not Psalms

POEMS. By A. M. KLEIN. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1944. 82 pp. \$2.00.

Reviewed by RANDALL JARRELL

MR. KLEIN's poems are academic, semi-religious verse about (1) representative experiences of the moderately religious life and (2) the persecution of the Jews during the present quantitatively unique intensification of the Diaspora. Let me consider them first as poetry; second, as religious poetry; third, as responses to, expressions of, the Third Reich's systematic liquidation of the Jews of Europe.

In the first place, pieces like these are not poetry but verse; even a glance at their language is enough to bring this home to the reader. The language has none of the exact immediacy, the particular reality of the language of a successful poem; it has instead the voluntary repetition of the typical mannerisms of poetry in general—mannerisms that become a generalized, lifeless, and magical ritual without the spirit of which they were once the peculiar expression. Mr. Klein uses forms and metres, epithets and rhetoric, with the innocent freedom of the born writer of verse—who is always, willing or unwilling, at ease in Zion. If he were to make himself into a poet he would be appalled to see everything suddenly difficult beyond hope, to find himself without even the illusion of freedom.

MR. KLEIN uses a form, writes about a subject, simply because he wants to; but this, for a poet, is as impossible as it is for you to love your enemies, to dream virtuous dreams, or to have "lots of will-power" simply because you want to. The general lack of freedom of the poet is grotesquely intensified in the specific lack of freedom of the poem—in which each part is determined not only by the demands of the incomplete tentative mass of the already existing parts, but by the overriding demands of the obscurely divined, problematic, and unique whole. These demands are grounded in the demands of the subject itself. Mr. Klein, in writing about the mass slaughters of Jewish

populations, has retained so much freedom that he can regularly use little jokes or satirical remarks, in the style of the light verse that is perhaps most congenial to him, in order to make the slaughterers ludicrous in our eyes; the poet who could treat this subject would be so possessed and dominated by it that such thoughts would not even occur for him to reject.

Thus one can say of Mr. Klein's verse that some of the jokes are possible, some of the rhetoric is effective, some of the emotion is felt—but all these works are useless without Grace. This is a typical enough quotation, about an adulterous generation that not only seeks but provides itself with signs:

*Sir Aries Virgo, astrology-professor,
Regards the stars, and prophesies five truces.
Herr Otto Shyrinzen, of the same guild, a
guesser,
From the same stars the contrary deduces.*

*. . . Ides is foretold, and doomsday, and
God's thunders.
January greets the unseen with a seer.
Augurs prognosticate, from signs and won-
ders,
Many a cradle, yea, and many a bier.*

Here are rhymes and metre and images and allusions and jokes and rhetoric, as thick as suet in plum-pudding. The rhymes are mechanical, those of a reasonably perfunctory writer of light verse; the metre is, paradoxically, at once sloppy and banging; most of the metaphors are dead, most of the jokes are embarrassingly obvious; and the most hopeful effect, the parody of Browning's "greet the unseen with a cheer" is ineffective because Browning's phrase has so much more rhetorical shock than Mr. Klein's. (Greeting the unseen with a cheer—a pathological response—is incomparably odder than greeting it with a seer, a normal procedure among the majority of mankind; Browning's phrase reads like a parody of Mr. Klein's.) In the approximate, stagey air of such verse everything seems manufactured, nothing born; and Mr. Klein's serious poems, though full of feeling, blunder to us from the same industrial,

confused, perpetually smoky realm of being. Contrast with Mr. Klein's verse this passage without rhymes, metre, allusions, or "poetic" effects—a real poetry on which it would be difficult to base any verse:

... How he follow'd with them and tack'd
with them and would not give it up,
How he saved the drifting company at last,
How the lank loose-gown'd women look'd
when boated from the side of their pre-
pared graves
How the silent old-faced infants and the
lifted sick, and the sharp-lipp'd un-
shaven men;
All this I swallow, it tastes good, I like it
well, it becomes mine,
I was the man, I suffer'd, I was there.

The exactness of epithet is only a little less notable than the wonderful evocative rightness of movement, the change from the slow, nightmarishly fixed rocking of the swells into the rush of the poet's enveloping, intent acceptance of, merging with, this edged fragment of his universe. And notice how seriously he produces its exact reality, how seen and felt each atom of it is. We learn from Mr. Klein's passage much about the devices of verse, from Whitman's much about the nature of poetry.

It was a mistake to call most of these poems psalms, and to number them as psalms, since this device keeps too sharply before us those real Psalms which Mr. Klein's resemble only externally. He has borrowed a little of their letter; but their whole spirit—the terrible immediacy, reality, seriousness, and *personalness* that make them read like some extraordinarily sublimated case history of the religious life—is alien to Mr. Klein, a pleasant, "well-adjusted," civilized man, as unconsciously secular as he is consciously religious. He often seems less to represent a religious culture than to reproduce it, with something of the outsider's conscious, objective, relishing appreciation of the picturesque: the events of life are given form by religion, but are not themselves religious in content. (Compare the saint who, asked what he would do if he had only an hour to live, replied that he would go on with his game of chess, since it was as much worship as anything else he had ever done.) In Mr. Klein's conscious mind there are no "doubts"—the religious triumphs over the secular with almost unseeing ease; he asks, in one of his best passages:

O Lord, in this my thirtieth year
What clever answer shall I bear
To those slick persons amongst whom

I sat, but was not in their room?

He answers, turning Milton upside-down, that the Lord will justify his ways to them. Yet in another poem he proposes to break into heaven, "seek out the abominable scales on which the heavenly justice is mis-weighed," and "leave those scales gloriously broken, that ever thereafter justice shall be done." That a religious poet should say it and not even notice that he has said it, not even attempt to mediate between it and the absolutely contradictory sayings that form the substance of his work, is more than extraordinary. When the world judges those leagued against it, the soul and its God, and the soul obliviously consents to that judgment as its own, who can fail to see the significance of so Freudian an error? In a real psalm this judgment against His justice would be recognized as suffering, only to be condemned, cancelled out, and sublimated into an acceptance incapable of any judgment; the structure of such religious poems has its ground in the structure of such religious experiences—in their irrational, almost physiological dialectic of suffering, with its opposites struggling into a final reconciled, accepting ecstasy.

But this guaranteeing particularity, *personalness*, is what Mr. Klein's work always lacks; everything he writes about seems bookish, unimmediate, not at all out of his own personal experience. He writes about tortures, mass executions, concentration camps, the cattle cars in which men die standing in quicklime, so that the first thing one thinks is, "He was never there, either in the flesh or in the spirit." One picture or one quoted speech tells more about them than everything in his poems; his knowledge is a knowledge he possesses like any other, but is not possessed by. Mr. Klein—speaking, rather extraordinarily, through the mouth of the Emperor Solomon, surrounded by SS men—predicts that his oppressors will perish:

Tomorrow no bright sun may rise to throw
Rays of inductive reason on Judaeophobic
foe.

How reasonable and inductive a conclusion! A Pangloss come to judgment! Contrast with this the Psalm beginning "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion"—and ending, as people so often forget: "O daughter of Babylon who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." This appalling ferocity is the other side of the passive longing sadness that people remember; both are so, the

poet has hidden neither. Can anyone imagine the writer of this Psalm making fun of his oppressors as ludicrous lunatics and scoundrels? We permit the peasant of the Middle Ages to present Herod as a comic bogeyman; but such an attitude, besides being historically jejune, is fantastically inappropriate to those whose crimes make Herod's real or imagined ones seem mere personal failings. Maidanek, Birkenau, Dachau—all those names that are more terrible for the living than any others will ever be—stand for the most forbidding, inexorable, and compulsive subject of our century. Mr. Klein, understandably and even laudably, has been drawn to a type of writing and a subject that are not only uncongenial to but completely beyond the scope of his gentler talents. But which of us, swallowed up in the sackcloth of the prophet, can by his own doing give more than a few brave and wooden squeaks?

IF THE reader wishes to see and to feel what happened at Maidanek or in the Warsaw ghetto, he should read the twenty-ninth and thirtieth chapters of Jan Karski's *Story of a Secret State*. Mr. Karski (if I may judge from the rest of his book) is a man without any literary talents worth mentioning; but in these chapters what he saw and heard and felt has made for itself an expression independent of either Mr. Karski or his readers—an expression that will force from the dullest or most heartless reader a helpless *I was the man, I suffered, I was there*. When one reads the terrible words of the Zionist leader and the head of the Jewish Socialist Alliance—spoken in the darkness of a ruined house at the edge of the Warsaw ghetto—one realizes that there have been men living in our time who were not the epigoni but the true heirs of the men who wrote the Psalms.

Pessimism With A Purpose

VOHIN GEHEN MIR? ("Where Are We Going? Jewish Migration, Past and Present.") By JACOB LESTCHINSKY. New York, Jewish National Workers' Alliance, 1944. 135 pp. \$1.00.

Reviewed by ISRAEL KNOX

MR. LESTCHINSKY is a sociologist and economist, especially interested in the factual-statistical aspect of Jewish life, in which field his contributions have been of considerable value. He is also an excellent journalist, investing his data with dramatic quality and contemporary pertinence. But Mr. Lestchinsky is

a writer with a "purpose," he is a sociologist with a point of view, and it is not always easy to determine whether his point of view serves to illuminate and coordinate his discrete facts and objective data, or compels him to lend undue emphasis to some of the facts and to interpret them in such a way as to distort them.

IN THIS book Mr. Lestchinsky is concerned with Jewish migrations—their socio-economic compulsions, their character and consequences. When he deals with the past, Mr. Lestchinsky treads on pretty solid ground. The nexus between his theory and his facts is visible to the eye and no special optical instruments are necessary. His guiding thesis contains a measure of truth and has been accepted by some students of Jewish history. He holds that the admission of Jews into a given country, the degree of tolerance accorded them, and their subsequent oppression or expulsion, are invariably conditioned by their economic relationship to that country. As long as the Jew can perform a useful and sometimes indispensable function, his presence is welcome—or at least not frowned upon—but as soon as that function can be filled by non-Jews, he is no longer wanted: the honeymoon is over. Obviously, it is not the *function* that ceases to be important; but the *Jewish* performer of that function becomes superfluous.

The process has moved on several levels: Jews were allowed to engage in pursuits that involved great physical and financial hazard, or were insufficiently remunerative and were looked down upon. At times they were encouraged in their middle-class activities by the feudal aristocracy of an economically backward country wishing to stave off the development of a native bourgeoisie with a revolutionary "potential."

Mr. Lestchinsky is convinced that, despite the progressive role of the Jew in the early stages of capitalism and despite his emancipation—indeed, because of it—the same relationship has prevailed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Emancipation has given the Jew equality, but it has also produced *economic anti-Semitism*—an anti-Semitism directed primarily against the Jewish middle classes but also reaching out to Jewish workers and other groups, especially in periods of depression and crisis. It is no sheer accident that over four million Jews have found it expedient in the last hundred years to leave their Central and East European homes and seek a chance to live elsewhere.

Viewing the international scene, Mr. Lestchinsky becomes utterly pessimistic and sees the Jews as a helpless and unwelcome mi-

nority everywhere, as "strangers" in "lands of bondage." His pessimism is not confined to Europe but also encompasses South America and the United States. Everywhere, he feels, the Jews are sitting on top of a volcano. At best they will be required—and in most instances, following the line of least resistance, will do so of their own volition—to surrender their national selfhood, their cultural distinctness, and to assimilate; at worst they may be subjected to pogroms and dealt with in Nazi fashion. Mr. Lestchinsky does not pretend to be a prophet and does not insist unreservedly that such is the fore-ordained fate of Jewish Americans; but when his Cassandra-like pronouncements are impugned or decried he points to Germany, suggesting that there too in the halcyon anti-Nazi days Jews were confident, incredulous and complacent.

His pessimism vanishes, however, when he talks of Palestine and here Mr. Lestchinsky's heart fills with hope. It is the only bright spot in the world—bright in its actuality and in its promise. Here the Jew need not fear that his economic role will soon be exhausted and his national distinctness become a thorn in the flesh of the majority. Emigration directed, therefore, toward Palestine has meaning and validity both for the individual Jew and for the Jews as a nation.

MR. LESTCHINSKY'S pessimism is not "metaphysical," nor is it "nihilistic"; it is "practical" pessimism with a purpose—indeed with a mission. It is an inordinate exaggeration of one phase of Zionism—its contempt for, and its disbelief in, the Diaspora. This kind of Zionism overlooks all the difficulties of its own program.

Indubitably, some of the dangers pointed out by Mr. Lestchinsky are very real, but they are not overcome by creating the impression that Palestine can now accommodate all the Jews of Europe and that Zionism can solve all our problems and avert all our tragedies. The truth of the matter is that the Jews are a world people, whether we like it or not, and they will remain a world people for a long time to come. Hence, while building Palestine, we must not divert our attention from Europe and must not relinquish our position and rights there or elsewhere. The most "realistic" approach to the "Jewish question" is also the most universal one—the approach grounded in the realization that our welfare, our "destiny," is inseparable from the "destiny" of mankind and that only a free and democratic society can guarantee our safety, security and dignity as individual Jews and as a people. The world is shrinking and hatred travels fast, and our "salvation" cannot be achieved in any one corner of the world un-

less it is at the same time part of a free world.

As yet not a single country with a long tradition of democracy in theory and practice has succumbed to totalitarianism. The United States is such a country. There are now some five million Jews here; their children and their children's children will live here too. Whatever our Jewish philosophy may be—Zionist or non-Zionist, religious or secularist—all of us must envisage our future in connection with America's democratic future and the emergence of "one world." We must help shape that future. There is no other way.

Better Than King James

THE BIBLE AND THE COMMON READER.

By MARY ELLEN CHASE. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1944. 315 pp. \$2.50.

Reviewed by THEODOR H. GASTER

THE object of this book is to present the Bible, considered as literature, to the "common reader." The author believes that the true character of the scriptural writings can be seized even through the medium of translation, provided that the translation in question is the so-called Authorized or King James Version, the delicate sensitivity of which she regards as truer to the spirit of the original than the more pedantic and literary accuracy of recent scholarly renderings.

The book is divided into three parts. The first gives the history of the Authorized Version and of its antecedents, carefully pointing out how the latter may be regarded as successive stepping-stones to the ultimate glory of the former. The second deals strictly with the Old Testament. To a brief sketch of Israelitic history, which serves as a background, is added a series of somewhat rapturous, though by no means uncritical, appraisals of the literary style and excellence of the several books of the Old Testament. The third part deals in similar vein with the New Testament.

There can be no doubt that Miss Chase possesses fine judgment and an exquisite sense of verbal felicity and that her delicate sense reveals many nuances and shades which would be imperceptible to a more literal interpreter. At the same time, it is to be feared that her entire approach is fraught with danger. Insofar as the Old Testament is concerned, it can at best present it as English rather than as Hebrew literature. In the first place, no sound student of the Hebrew scriptures will assent to the basic proposition that the spirit of that compilation is adequately reproduced in the

Authorized Version. Nobility of language cannot obscure a certain artificial uniformity of style, which tends to efface the characteristic peculiarities of the original. The laws of leprosy are reproduced in somewhat the same verbal style as the Song of Songs. What is clearly archaic in the Hebrew is not so distinguished in the English. The rhythm of historical sagas derived from poetic epics is converted into sonority rather than cadence. The various styles and genres of literature are indistinguishable. Slang expressions are translated into what is literally the King's English. Consequently, judgments formed on the basis of this rendering are bound to be misleading, since it is itself a distorting mirror, albeit fashioned of the rarest glass.

What we need is an assessment of Biblical literature in the light of all that we have come to know, during the past fifty years, of contemporary and earlier Near Eastern writing and culture. Especially must the various literary genres be related to what Hermann Gunkel so aptly called their *Sitz im Leben*. The literary canons of prophetic writing must be related, for example, to the conventions of oracular diction out of which they may largely have developed. The various classes and types of psalms must be distinguished, as Gunkel distinguished them, and referred to the different conventions which governed the various forms of liturgical composition. The relation of prose to verse and the influence on literary structure of the Oriental habit of cantillation are subjects which cannot be ignored in any adequate introduction to the literature of the Bible. Yet all of these points are necessarily neglected in an approach which does not start from the original Hebrew. That is why there is danger as well as merit in Miss Chase's method.

Something too has to be said in such an introduction about the actual genius of the Hebrew language, for the effectiveness of any given passage of prose or verse depends just as much upon the innate possibilities of vocabulary as upon the dexterity with which a given author deploys it.

Nor is it only from the strictly literary point of view that something more is required than a feeling for style and a certain verbal tact. It is likewise impossible to place the Old Testament in its proper setting unless these very admirable qualifications be enhanced by a sound knowledge of recent archaeological and historical research. For only thus can the cultural background be properly depicted. In the present case, such knowledge would have prevented some unfortunate blunders. The statement, for example (on page 31), that "the Hebrews belong racially to that larger group of ancient

peoples known as Semites" is quite unsatisfactory. We now know, on the one hand, that the name Hebrew was appellative rather than ethnic, and covered persons of the most varied stock, so that not all Hebrews were of a piece. On the other hand, we also know that there is no such thing as a Semite or a Semitic race. Like its counterpart "Aryan," the term denotes only a group of languages.

These and similar errors, however, as well as the basic danger of the entire approach, should not obscure the positive merits of this book within its own limits. As a literary appreciation of the Bible as viewed through the prism of the Authorized Version, it is admirable and well worth reading. There are few more delicate critics than Miss Chase, and she has certainly made a contribution to Old Testament studies by the illuminating intuition which she has brought to bear upon the scriptural text. At the same time, it would be dangerous to follow her beyond these limits and to take her book as an adequate introduction of the Bible to the "common reader."

The Creation of an Identity

THE TABLES OF THE LAW. By THOMAS MANN. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1945. 63 pp. \$2.50.

Reviewed by HAROLD ROSENBERG

JOSEPH was the last of the Fathers, and after his time the children of Israel were no longer a family of epic individuals but a nation, a mass.

Now, while an individual forms himself by imitating in his own way the actions and moods of other individuals, real or partly real or wholly imagined, a mass is given form by the acknowledgment of universals and obedience to laws.

Hence in his *Joseph* series, Mann re-created the pattern of God-actions begun by Abraham and extended to completion out of the mists of memory by Joseph; he showed how the ironic glad-sorry spirit of the Fathers, simultaneously at home on the earth of practical dealings and in the eternal rounds of divine destiny, triumphed over the rigid hieratic tomb culture of the Land of the Pharaohs.

But in *The Tables Of The Law* Mann's subject has changed from that of a culture-form in a state of development by individuals to the problem of imposing a Code on the decadent procession of slaves herded forth from Egypt on the night of tears and confusion. The new book is the story of Moses and of his leadership up to the moment when he de-

scended from the mountain with the stone Commandments in his solid hands.

True, the Code was but a new expression of the God-relation established by Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. However, since this tie with the Eternal was no longer something personal but intended for all, a regulator of daily behavior rather than an inspirer of deathless deeds, its later personification had to be a man quite different from the lover, dreamer and teller of tales, Joseph.

Not Charm but Power—physical and moral—was Moses' outstanding virtue. And Power to Mann goes hand in hand with inhibition and suppression. "His birth was irregular," the narrator begins, "hence it was he passionately loved order, the absolute, the shalt and shalt not. In his youth . . . he had killed a man; so he knew . . . that it is forbidden to kill. His senses were hot, so he craved the spiritual, the pure, the holy. . . ." Striving against himself, Mann's Moses lacks the finer points of sensibility, poise and feeling. He is the "closed fist" type familiar in Mann's references, at least since *His Royal Highness*. And sure enough, almost all that Mann gives us of personal description of Moses is, "His arms dangled along his sides and his fists shook in a way they had when he talked." A pent-up man with a flat nose and a stormy brow.

The Tables Of The Law is thus the narrative—it is hardly a story in the ordinary sense—of a revolutionary moralist bent on hewing and shaping the formless mass of sub-cultural Hebrew proletariat into the image of a nation acceptable to the "Invisible God." From the moment Moses discovered Jahwe, the mountain-god whom "you could not see but who saw you," and identified him as El Elyon, God of the Fathers, he began his going among the hovels of Goshen and his hammering upon the minds of the bondsmen in order to set them apart for Him as a folk and make them one. And this hammering and hewing he continued throughout the release from Egypt and the windings in the desert, until he brought forth from the mass the shape of a people and fixed it forever in setting before and over it the Tables of the Law, themselves the work of the hammer and hewing tool.

So passionately engrossed was Moses in the spiritual labors of creating a group identity, a transcendental whole, out of the given mob material, that he was prone to overlook practical details—this again derives from Mann's general conception of the extremist—and it was fortunate that he had at his side Joshua, representative of the world of matter and a man of action. Mann has it that Joshua trained a band of young fighters and that it was he and his "avenging angels" who brought about the tenth plague,

the only one which cannot be explained by natural causes. The "angels" also backed up Moses with the threat of force when the people grumbled against him.

IN THIS matter of the realistic interpretation of Biblical events, *The Tables Of The Law* is for the most part far inferior to the *Joseph* series. There, the qualities of mystery and divinity were preserved and even lyrically strengthened while being brought into consistency with modern experience—as when Benjamin subconsciously recognized, and yet did not know, Joseph. Or in the high comedy of Joseph's prophecy of the seven fat and lean years. In the *Tables*, however, there is little of either transcendental ambiguity or philosophical comedy; the realism is often little better than common-sense "debunking," with overtones of Freud's *Moses*. Thus the idea that Moses was the illegitimate son of Pharaoh's daughter may be credible enough, but the conception lacks imagination and artistic purpose. And to wipe out the whole drama of Moses' negotiations with Pharaoh with the loaded-dice supposition that "standing as he did on the firm ground of his relation to Ramessu, his grandfather in the lust of the flesh . . . Moses had in his hand the means of applying pressure," comes close to the intellectual vulgarity of most modernizings; as does his synthetic account of Aaron and Miriam's protest against Moses' Ethiopian wife.

The Tables Of The Law is definitely not Mann at his best, and this may have something to do with the fact that its theme and its hero are not congenial to his talents. Certainly, the hard moralist has always been a subsidiary character in Mann's work, his imagination responding rather to the citizen who has found in himself "a moist spot" of love and mystery. Mann does not discern much that is really wonderful in Moses—aside from the internal evidences of lack of interest, there is the fact that, while he devotes five volumes to the life of Joseph, the vast events of the period from the birth of Moses to the giving of the Law are covered in some 25,000 words. Nor does he make the same gainful sorties into the Aggadah that he did for *Joseph*. The only genuine literary accomplishment in the work are the pages where Mann recomposes the "thou-shalt-nots" of Numbers into a kind of poem of moral labors, taking it for granted that all those commands against abominations—sleeping with one's sister, eating snails or animals with paws, being rude and thievish—and the commands to keep clean, honor parents, serve one God, were in the nature of a hose which Moses turned on the existing domestic filth that fouled the minds and the habitations of the escaped slaves of the

Land of Mud. This verbal finger-shaking is the most eloquent portion of *The Tables Of The Law*.

In sum, the book should be recognized as a minor effort, not only in comparison with the *Joseph* series and *The Magic Mountain* but even in relation to such short tales as *A Death In Venice* and *Mario and The Magician*. The *Tables* appeared originally in 1943 in *The Ten Commandments*, an anthology of stories by ten eminent writers aimed at Fascist values. It bears all the earmarks of an occasional piece in which the author's artistic machinery was, so to speak, allowed to run at low speed. Considering the confusion that already exists in America as to what is really great in Mann and what is mere routine "Parnassus"—many sensitive readers rejecting him entirely on account of the latter—I question whether the publisher did not do his reputation a disservice (temporary, of course) in re-issuing *The Tables Of The Law* in a separate volume, at the regular price and with excessive claims. Mann's chief motive for composing it is most likely disclosed in the concluding speech, which is obviously directed at Hitler.

The Question Dodged

FELIX MENDELSSOHN: LETTERS. Edited by G. SELDEN-GOTH. New York, Pantheon Books Inc., 1945. 373 pp. \$2.50.

Reviewed by KURT LIST

FELIX MENDELSSOHN'S music in recent years has assumed an importance far beyond its inherent value. This is due in no small measure to anti-Mendelssohn propaganda on the part of the Nazis. Because his music seems so deeply rooted in German romanticism, both ideologically and musically, and because his work represented a substantial part of the concert repertory of pre-Hitler Germany, he is considered as the chief example of the alien intruder by anti-Semites, and the prototype of the emancipated Jew by others.

Ever since the beginning of emancipation composers of Jewish origin followed one of three tendencies in integrating themselves in the culture of their respective countries. One tendency was embodied by those who consciously introduced Jewish religious themes into Western music—Halévy, Bruch, Goldmark and Bloch. Others, like Mahler and Schoenberg, were assimilated enough to initiate new musical directions that were entirely indigenous to Western music. And then there were those who, like Offenbach and Meyerbeer, dodged the Jewish issue, proclaimed themselves as French—or Ger-

man or Italian—as the next man, yet could not help displaying pronounced Jewish traits. Mendelssohn belonged to this category.

That he was hardly aware of his Jewishness enabled Mendelssohn to enter the strange world of pixies, mystery and obscurantism that characterized the German romantic movement of his time. But that, as Mrs. Selden-Goth states in her introduction, "there is not a single bar in his compositions inspired by motives of Jewish folksong or synagogue music" is a rather strong exaggeration when one recalls certain turns in his famous violin concerto or some of the slower movements of his symphonies. Nor does Mendelssohn seem to have been completely oblivious of Jewish tradition. His grandfather Moses had played a decisive role in the history of Jewish emancipation, a role of which the family was exceptionally proud. The first names of his parents were Abraham and Lea, and those of his sisters, Rebecca and Fanny—names that would hardly have adorned the baptismal certificates of non-Jewish children in the Germany of 1809.

But what is more important is the fact that Mendelssohn's contemporaries were quite conscious of his Jewish origin. Mrs. Selden-Goth remarks: "The famous conversion of Abraham Mendelssohn and his family had lifted the talented child (Felix) far above the complex and problematic intellectual world of his forefathers." And then again: "It was not the racial issue, merely the religious one, that had been raised in Germany of that time." But she herself quotes a letter from Zelter, Mendelssohn's teacher, to Goethe in which young Felix is introduced with the words, "To be sure, he is the son of a Jew, but no Jew himself. . . . It would really be *eppes rores* if the son of a Jew turned out to be an artist." The last sentence, and especially the use of the Yiddish jargon, can hardly be interpreted as evidence of complete disregard of Mendelssohn's Jewish origin.

The problem of Mendelssohn's emancipation was construed artificially by the Nazis, but it was very real and rooted in the composer's time. Unfortunately, these well-translated letters offer hardly any clue to the composer's feelings in the matter. This is partly because of the deletion of all objectionable and controversial passages, insisted upon by the composer's family when the letters were first published after his death. (It is unknown whether other topics than his love life were affected by this measure.) Partly, of course, it is because of Mendelssohn's deliberate avoidance of the issue and partly because of the unavailability of sufficient original material, which, if not destroyed by now, is in its bulk in the possession of the Berlin State Library.

Thus the editor has had to confine herself to

whatever material was available in already existing English translations or in archives and libraries outside Germany. Nevertheless, Mrs. Selden-Goth has made excellent selections; never repetitious, they make extremely interesting and appealing reading. They show the attractive character of the tender and sensitive, even if slightly superficial, young man-about-town. But more than that they offer a most impressive picture of Western Europe in the first third of the 19th Century. Mendelssohn's descriptions of the old Goethe, his humorous reports of a performance of *Hamlet* in the England of 1829 and of the coronation of the Hungarian king in Pressburg, and the vivid criticisms of the Papal Choir in Rome are invaluable contributions to social history.

That this book does not contribute anything to the problem of German-Jewish cultural relations—and how important this would have been can be gleaned from a caption under the composer's picture in *Time* magazine, saying with deliberate primitiveness, "He partly agreed with Goebbels"—is the fault of our era which destroys the evidence together with the victim.

Racialism in Reverse

THE MORAL CONQUEST OF GERMANY.

By EMIL LUDWIG. Garden City, Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1945. 183 pp. \$2.00.

Reviewed by ALFRED WERNER

THE first ninety-six pages of this book ought to be studied carefully. They constitute an alarming specimen of what Leon Blum once termed "racialism in reverse." Ludwig claims that there exists such a phenomenon as "German character," not as a heuristic construction, but as a "genuine reality." That character is not only unchangeable, but also 100 per cent black—as the Nazis claimed the "Jewish character" to be.

It is not this reviewer's intention to whitewash the murderers of Maidanek; but the pseudo-science of Nazism cannot be fought by anti-Nazi pseudo-science. Metaphysics is not facts. Enough of the dismal traits commonly attributed to Germans can be shown to be neither metaphysically nor biologically inherent, but induced by sociological factors, and Ludwig did not have to go out of his way to create additional black spots in order to drive home his lesson. He draws what he considers to be a psychological portrait of "the" contemporary German, confronting it with one of "the" contemporary American. Sober readers will be repelled by his crude black-and-white technique

and by his tail-wagging attempt to ingratiate himself to American sentiment. According to Ludwig, no German would stop for a minute to give a hand to a fellow-man in trouble. The innocuous word *Herr* in the phrase "*Herr Doktor*" is for Ludwig a trait of servility—he overlooks the fact that the French use a similar phrase: "*Monsieur le Docteur*." And just listen to some of his statements: "The American habit of basking in the sun for pure enjoyment is completely foreign to the German. . . . The German is seldom as happy a man as his American counterpart. . . . The tension within the German character can . . . be read in the German face. . . . Germany is the only country which lacks a hero of liberty. . . . German history knows of practically no outstanding woman. . . . German literature contains not a single great love epic . . ." and so on ad infinitum.

Dangerous, too, is Ludwig's attempt to paint the Prussians even blacker than the other Germans. His inconsistency is amazing: first he condemns all Germans, then he exculpates the majority, implicitly, by blaming militarism, aggressiveness and so forth on the Prussians. Needless to say, it would be poor policy to create a scapegoat within the German nation—and actually Nazism started in Bavaria and most of the top Nazis were of non-Prussian descent.

The author, who in Part One implies that the Germans are incurable, asserts in Part Two that they should be re-educated. Peculiarly, he would like to exclude them from some of the most essential departments of education. For if the Germans are not allowed to travel abroad, if there is no freedom of speech in Germany, if German museums are not permitted to contain any but German art, if, in short, Germany should become a "virtual island," democracy would never have a chance in Germany. Instead, Germany would continue to be a breeding ground of mental disease.

Ludwig's views on the delicate topic of German-Jewish relations are not satisfactory either. There will be many who will heartily agree with him that: "One should not fear, but ardently hope, that the Jews will harbor a deep resentment against the German people for centuries to come. One thing German Jews should avoid under all circumstances—return to Germany." But Jews must not be isolationists, regardless of what they have suffered in the past. They have their share of responsibility in the realm of human affairs like all other groups. But Ludwig goes even further: "No émigré, Communist or Jew," he warns "should ask for, or accept, an assignment as judge over the one-time oppressors of his kind. Jews should eliminate themselves a priori from any governmental combination in postwar Germany. If some do,

however, return to Germany under Allied protection, they should stay away from re-education work." We believe that if Jews or any other foes of Nazism should voluntarily relinquish any of their rights — or duties — in order to appease Germans, this moral retreat would indicate a moral conquest, not of Germany by the Allies, but of the United Nations by the spirit of Nazism.

The conclusion forced upon one by this book is that Ludwig's lack of faith in the Germans is exceeded by his lack of faith in himself, in the Jews and in anti-Nazis in general. At the source of his errors lies an enormous feeling of inferiority—not to the Germans, but to all those who wield power.

Last of the Red-Hot Mammas

SOME OF THESE DAYS. By SOPHIE TUCKER. Garden City, Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1945. 309 pp. \$2.50.

Reviewed by MARY MCCARTHY

FOR the title of her autobiography, Sophie Tucker takes the name of her theme song, a phrase of promise and improbable hope, both melancholy and buoyant. It is (or was) the theme song of the immigrant, of the man who starts at the bottom of the ladder, the boy who may grow up to be president; it is (or was) the national motto of the land of opportunity. "Some of these days you're going to be so lonely . . ." i.e., in the indefinite future everything will be turned upside down, the unloved will be loved, the rejector rejected, the poor, rich, and the ugly, beautiful. In other words, all the laws of probability will be violated; and the aptness of the title to the book is flagrant, for the whole career of this hefty *chanteuse* was an insult to the laws of probability.

Who would have thought that Sophie Abuza, a fat girl from Hartford, Connecticut, daughter of a poor Russian-Jewish immigrant and restaurant-keeper, would one day be dressed in silks and satins, singing before the crowned heads of Europe? This is the culmination, but the autobiography is a long graduated necklace of these triumphant paradoxes, these showy reprisals on nature and fortune. Who would have thought that the burlesque trouser who brought shame to the home of her respectable parents would one day be welcomed back to Hartford with placards and banners as the headliner in the big Hartford theatre? Who would have thought that the girl a two-by-four theatrical producer disdained as too fat would one day be pulling down two thousand a week? The life of this woman was a day-

dream come true. To all the scoffers, the doubters, the indifferent, she made the unanswerable retort of fame and financial success. She "showed" them again and again.

Now, of all fields of human activity, the entertainment world offers the finest opportunities for scoring off one's past, partly because the eventual reward in terms of *réclame* is greater here than in any field except the highest reaches of politics; partly because the way up the ladder is harder, even for the person of talent, than in any comparable profession and there are therefore more humiliations, defeats, slights, insults, and injustices to be paid off—if only in imagination—once the performer reaches the top, and the greater the debt the handsomer the settlement; partly because all the gradations of the obscurity-fame, failure-success graph, which elsewhere may be marked in only the roughest way, are charted with the finest accuracy in the minds of all theatrical persons from the understudy to the producer and are signalized not only by variations in income but by differences in billing, by the size of type and the order in which a name appears on a program or a marquee, by the location of the dressing rooms, etcetera, and also by the volume of press clippings and the adjectives of theatrical critics, so that the successful performer is not alone in measuring the distance he has traveled but multiplies his awareness through sycophants, friends, and associates; and finally because, where the business man, say, is obliged, in the interests of sanity, to integrate, in the theatrical person, whose life is masquerade, two selves may coexist, the outer self which is staging a drama of success, and the "real" self which sits marveling in a cheap seat in the gallery.

For no actor is this last more true than for the Jewish comedian. The movie star is compelled, officially at any rate, to suppress the Montana high school girl, the Minneapolis mother's helper, or the Florida beauty-contest winner who was the point of departure, and suppressing her publicly she half-forgets her privately (thereby losing her best audience); to a lesser extent this goes for the stage actress and the leading man, and for such semi-professional stars as Clare Luce and the Duchess of Windsor, for whom Aunt Bessie seems to substitute for the discarded old self. But with the Jewish comedian the *chiaroscuro* between origins and ends is the very principle of his art. It is his Jewishness that is the permanent joke, not his Jewishness *per se*, but the incongruity of this Jewishness to its surroundings, to the dazzle of worldly success, the spotlights, the white shirt-fronts of the audience, the sparkling

sequins of the showgirls; it is simplicity against sophistication, piety against irreligion, the homely stone in the glittering setting—and quite possibly some intuition of the obscurity-fame contrast led many of these comedians, thirty years ago, to symbolize the dark-light relation in black-face and evening dress.

Sophie Tucker was one of these symbolists. She began as a "coon shouter" in variety and burlesque, and though she hated the black-face and at length fought her way out of it, she merely exchanged it for another and more exquisite contrast, the disparity between her build and character, on the one hand, and her gowns and hot songs on the other. Her Jewishness she seldom exploited directly (her big blond body did not lend itself to this), yet the joke was the same in essence and even crueller, more masochistic, for being more personal and less ethnic—it was the ludicrous relation between herself and sex that she invited her audiences to laugh at. The point was that the last of the red-hot mammas was only hot subjectively; to the audiences she was mamma in a racy mood, mamma come out of the kitchen with a few drinks in her and being the life of the party. It might be protested that it was only to our puritanized magazine-cover taste that Sophie did not appeal, that to the true male there is nothing like a good armful of a woman, but the fact is that her offstage sexual experience refutes this argument—Sophie was a good scout but her marriages did not work out. The price she paid for the upkeep of the two selves was that her men never mistook the Paris dress for the woman; in fame and money she traveled transcontinental distances, but in love she remained at home.

This discrepancy gives her autobiography a certain pathos, but it is the pathos of the tycoon. For though Sophie's dream of theatrical success was girlish, her methods of achieving it were masculine, and the means conditioned the end. Hard-working, tireless, strategic, sentimental, materialistic, gregarious, sporting, cold, Sophie brought to bear on her career the combined resources of the industrial promoter and the public relations counsel. Her natural good-will, sociability, and fair-mindedness she harnessed to the commercial enterprise that was

her personality. She never made an enemy or forgot a friend, kept an enormous card-catalogue that contained the name of every person she had ever met; whenever, on tour, she visited a city, she sent out postcards of greeting to all her former acquaintances who were listed under the name of that city, thus assuring herself of an unpaid claque in the theatre all week. A less shrewd operator would have then called it a day, but Sophie, mindful already of her next visit, took the precaution of sending out, on her departure, a second wave of postcards, conveying thanks and farewell. With gifts, birthday greetings, and condolences she was as regular as an insurance salesman. She supported her poor relations, was kind to her maid, generous to stagehands and stage doormen, kept up the Jewish observances, was never upstage, never sulky. No stone was left unturned, everything was calculated; she even trusted to her spontaneity on the stage as a business man trusts to a law of the market. And if there is a kind of horror in all this, it is hard to locate it precisely, for there is no doubt that this woman actually possessed all the traits she simulated—was it a crime to put them to use?

One can only say that the sight of the affective qualities harnessed to the machine of a career is as gruesome a spectacle as child-labor, and in precisely the same way. Sophie Tucker made herself into a curiosity, a national phenomenon. To watch this woman putting herself over on a stage or in a night-club was like watching a gang of convict laborers in a salt mine—like all oppressed persons (including hard-working executives) she had lost her humanity. The proof of this lay always before her: unlike the true stars of her period—Fannie Brice, Durante, Willie Howard, Jolson, and even Jessel—she was never loved by her audiences. Significantly enough, she was most popular with the English, who have always retained a tourist's relation to America and prefer American phenomena to American art. Her career was a sensational fulfillment of the American dream and an ironic comment on it. She sent her boy to Yale but like the tired business man in the front row she was too busy (quotation marks) to see much of him. Her true relaxation was playing poker.

**SUPERVISION OF
INVESTMENT ACCOUNTS
ON A FEE BASIS**

RALPH E. SAMUEL & CO.

115 BROADWAY
NEW YORK 6, N. Y.

BArcley 7-4960

Members

NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
COMMODITY EXCHANGE, INC.
NEW YORK CURB EXCHANGE (ASSOC.)